THE COUNCIL OF CHALCEDON AND THE CHRISTOLOGY OF SEVERUS OF ANTIOCH

A Dissertation
Presented to
the Faculty of the Graduate School
Yale University

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

by
illakuvel herian
V. C. Samuel

May 1957

V. C. Samuel

A SUMMARY STATEMENT

The Eastern branch of the Church which to this day repudiates the Council of Chalcedon venerates Dioscorus of Alexandria who is commonly believed to have been deposed as a monophysite heretic. But Dioscorus himself and his followers have denied the charge of monophysitism against them. This work is intended to examine whether there is any ground for a charge of this kind against them.

Dioscorus was deposed at Chalcedon. The fact, however, is that it was not the decision of any session of the Council. A section of the bishops who had come for the Council passed that resolution. At the first session of the Council some of these bishops had accused him of holding views akin to those of Eutyches. But Dioscorus answered the charge, by indicating that there was no evidence to regard Eutyches as having maintained the views which were being attributed to him, and that if he actually held them he was a heretic. The charges made against Dioscorus in the course of the several sittings of the Council were: (a) that he defended Eutyches; (b) that he excommunicated Leo of Rome who had opposed Eutyches; and (c) that he employed terrorism at the Council of Ephesus in 449 to establish the heretical teachings of Eutyches as orthodoxy. In regard to the first of these charges, we have no evidence that Eutyches had really taught the ideas ascribed to him. That Dioscorus excommunicated Leo, was not even mentioned during the first session of the Council of Chalcedon, though his opponents had tried [illegible] in all possible ways to establish some flaw against him. The charge of terrorism was thoroughly investigated at the first session of the Council. So far as the documents go, it was definitely disproved. As for his theology, our evidence, as contained in his reported sayings and literary remains, is that he was a loyal disciple of Cyril of Alexandria, his immediate predecessor. Therefore, the charge of monophsitism against Dioscorus has never been proved.

The followers of Dioscorus have, from the time of the Council, opposed monophysite teaching, and have made it clear that their objection to Chalcedon did not spring from ideas ascribed to Eutyches. On the other hand, they maintained that Chalcedon was guilty of introducing the theology of Nestorius as orthodoxy. In the sixth century Severus of Antioch gave clear expression to this view. He expressly excluded monophysitism. Remaining loyal to the Alexandrine theological tradition, he developed it, and answered Antiochene and Chalcedonian criticisms against it. For him, neither the Tome of Leo nor the Chalcedonian definition of the Faith did actually teach anything which Nestorius had not held . In opposition to the theology of Nestorius, by insisting on the phrase "One incarnate nature of God the Word", he emphasised a theological principle which was accordant with the approved tradition of the Church.

Sixth century defenders of Chalcedon, especially Leontius of Byzantium, did not show in works against Severus any real understanding of the latter's point. Leontius's theory of enhypostasia was not an advance on the teaching of Severus, nor did he work out any synthesis of ideas contained in the earlier traditions current in the East. In the Christology of Severus, on the other hand, we can find such a synthesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

PREFACE iii

INTRODUCTION. 1

PART I. THE NON-CHALCEDONIAN OPPOSITION TO THE COUNCIL OF CHALCEDON

Chapter

I. CHARGE AGAINST DIOSCORUS 16

II. DIOSCORUS AND THE COUNCIL OF CHALCEDON . 51

III. THE COUNCIL'S DEFINITIO AND DIOSCORUS' PROTEST 142

IV. THE SPLIT IN THE EASTERN CHURCH. . . . 197

V. THE LIFE AND WORK OF SEVERUS. 245

PART II. THE CHRISTOLOGY OF SEVERUS OF ANTIOCH

I. THE USE OF CRUCIAL TERMS 277

II. SEVERUS' OBJECTIONS TO THE COUNCIL OF CHALCEDON 294

III. "THE ONE INCARNATE NATURE OF GOD THE WORD". 347

IV. THE POSITIVE CHRISTOLOGICAL TEACHING OF SEVERUS 382

V. SEVERUS AND THE SIXTH CENTURY DEFENDERS OF CHALCEDON 415

CONCLUSION 449

BIBLIOGRAPHY. 459

PREFACE

I wrote my STM thesis at the Union Theological Seminary, New York, in 1954 on the Christology of Severus of Antioch, and that work is preserved in the Seminary Library. Following Western scholars, to whose works I happened to refer, I started on it assuming that Severus was a monophysite. But my subsequent study led me to call in question such an assumption, and my reasons may be stated briefly.

(1) Severus was a follower of Dioscorus of Alexandria. The latter was accused at Chalcedon of having maintained the theology of Eutyches, and the charge of monophysitism against Dioscorus and his followers goes back to that incident. But Dioscorus himself answered this charge at Chalcedon, and his followers have, all through the centuries, distinguished him from Eutyches. (2) In opposing Chalcedon, Dioscorus and his followers have argued that the Council did not teach anything which Nestorius had not maintained. In the light of modern Nestorian studies, this criticism cannot be ignored.

If this argument of Dioscorus and his followers against the Council of Chalcedon is defensible, their opposition to that Council was not really pointless. The charge of monophysitism against them has to be examined from two points of view. On the one hand, is there evidence that this charge has ever been proved against them? and on the other, in their positive statements of the Faith is there indication that they held a monophysite Christology?

These are the questions on which I have tried in this work to pay concentrated attention. My treatment of the history of the Council of Chalcedon and of the subsequent split in the Church, as well as of the Christology of Severus, is intended to bring out an answer to them. If my findings are sound, the Eastern section of the Church that repudiates the Council of Chalcedon to this day does not deserve to be characterised as monophysite. This can be an adequate basis for a theological conversation between the two branches of the Church, namely those who accept the Council and those who reject it.

As an STM thesis, my former work was examined by Professor George Florovsky and Professor Cyril Richardson, both of whom offered a number of valuable comments, which have helped me in this work, and I am deeply grateful to them both.

In carrying on the present work, the man to whom I am most indebted is Professor Robert L. Calhoun. He directed my study, helping me to weigh the documents carefully and draw conclusions permissible on the strength of evidence. In rendering some difficult Greek passages into English, and in putting several ideas in precise words, he assisted me very considerably. The comments and criticisms which he offered after reading the manuscript were of immense value. When I look back on the way in which he directed my work, I feel gratified that it was done under the guidance of one of the most outstanding scholars of our times. I owe him gratitude, respect and the warmest feeling of affection.

For my study in the United States leading up to this work, I am most indebted to the National Council of the Protestant Episcopal Church, to the Union Theological Seminary, New York, and to the Yale University Divinity School. My most sincere thanks to the Right Reverend Jno. B. Bentley, the Reverend Claude L. Pickens, Jr. and the Scholarship Committee of the National Council, to President Henry P. Van Dusen and the Fellowship Committee of the Union Seminary, and to Dean Liston Pope and the Fellowship Committee of the Yale Divinity School for all the help they have rendered me.

A work done at the cost of four years of separation from home, it testifies to the noble and ungrudging sacrifice of my aged mother and of my dear wife and son. I have missed them every day. However, the personal interest and affection shown me by friends among the students at the school and the very cordial relation with a number of friends outside, especially in several American homes, were a source of great joy for me. My warmest gratitude to every one of them.

The Yale Divinity School Library, the Yale University Library, the Union Theological Seminary Library, New York, and the General Theological Seminary Library, New York, lent me all the needed books and documents for this work. I am very grateful to the Librarians and staffs of these institutions. My special gratitude to the Librarian and staff of the Yale Divinity School for all their help, and particularly for the purchase of a microfilmed copy from the British Museum of the work of Severus against Julian of Halicarnassus.

For typing out the work from the original manuscript, I am grateful to Twila Hittler, Lois Miller, and Susan Millar.

Yale Divinity School,
Easter, 1957.

V. C. Samuel

INTRODUCTION

In the fourth and the fifth centuries the Church witnessed two major doctrinal controversies. The first led to the Nicene affirmation, according to which the life of Jesus Christ was the incarnate life of God the Son who is of the same substance with God the Father (ὁμοούσιον τῷ Πατρί). The second was based on the different ways in which the historical Person of Jesus Christ was being interpreted. The Council of Chalcedon in 451 affirmed that He was one Person in two natures.

In regard to these two decisions, one significant point has to be mentioned. Subsequent to each of them, there was violent reaction to the decision taken. Thus the Nicene decision of 325 came to be opposed by most of the East, with the exception of Egypt. However, in another forty years there developed in the East a theological interpretation which could favour the Nicene decision. The men who led this movement and their sympathisers met in Council at Constantinople in 381 and confirmed the doctrinal affirmations of the Council of 325. Though there was still continuing opposition to the Council of Nicea, it was short-lived. From the beginning of the fifth century the Church could look back officially on 325 as the year of victory for orthodoxy.

The story of the Council of Chalcedon was very different. Its opponents in the East to the present day have never shown any inclination to accept its Definition of the Faith. On the contrary, they continue to complain that the treatment which the Council meted out to their leader, Dioscorus of Alexandria, was flagrantly unjust, and that in its doctrinal decision the Council trespassed against the Faith of the Church, both by abandoning the already established theological emphasis and by introducing an idea which had been excluded by the Council of Ephesus in 431. On these two grounds, they renounced the Council both as an unjust and as a heretical gathering. The adherents of the Council, on the other hand, endeavoured in the sixth century to rectify the doctrinal flaw raised against the Council, but have never answered the charge of injustice. All the same, Chalcedon is reckoned as the fourth ecumenical Council by a vast majority in Christendom, for whom the critics of the Council were "monophysite" heretics who had broken away from the one Church.

On the strength of the fact that those who accept the Council of Chalcedon find its doctrinal decision satisfying, their right to interpret their understanding of the faith cannot be disputed. But that does not qualify them to ignore historical facts, or to characterise by means of a disparaging title an ecclesiastical tradition which claims to maintain the historic Faith of the Church, without even caring to examine whether there is any connection between it and that title. For any judgment in regard to the critics of Chalcedon, mere fairness demands the investigation of two points. One: from the time of the Council they have made two complaints against it. The rightness or wrongness of their complaints has to be objectively examined. Is there, for instance, any truth behind their argument that the Council was unjust to their leader and that the Chalcedonian Definition introduced an innovation in the Faith? Two: is the theological position of the Council's critics "monophysite"? These two questions have not been fairly faced in any of the many works in the field published in the Western world to which the present writer has had a chance to refer. On the contrary, they all assume that the Council of Chalcedon was an ecumenical Council and that its critics were "monophysites." In order to see the way in which uncritical assumptions of this kind have been perpetuated, we may refer to two authors of our times.

Writing on the Greek Orthodox conception of the nature of the Church, Professor Hamilcar Alivisatos of Greece maintains that there are only seven ecumenical

Councils, and that an eighth is not likely to be convened, because, subsequent to the seventh Council, Christendom became divided. These seven Councils, he insists, were Councils of the "undivided Church."[1] Professor Alivisatos is not writing on the split in the Church which occurred after Chalcedon. All the same, his argument obviously takes it for granted that, until after "the seventh ecumenical Council," there existed in history an "undivided Church." In other words, those who refused to accept the Council of Chalcedon, the fourth of the seven Councils, had not belonged to the Church at all.

The other author to whom we may refer is M. Deansely. Without a shadow of doubt in her own mind and without leaving any room for questions in the minds of her readers, Miss Deansely asserts that "the error of the Monophysites . . . had arisen from the teaching of Eutyches."[2] Though this author does not claim to be a scholar in that field of Church history, she can adduce eminent historians like B. J. Kidd, Abbe Duchsne and many others in support of her view. However, if this view were correct, what it amounts to is that a section of the Church in the East which included some of the best minds of the age decided to follow the lead of an old monk in Constantinople who, whatever else he was, was certainly not a theologian.

---

[1] The Nature of the Church, (ed. Newton Flew, SCM Press, London, 1952), p. 51.

[2] A History of the Medieval Church, p. 5. The term "Monophysite" was disparagingly ascribed to them by opponents. The corresponding term denoting the adherents of Chalcedon was "Dyophysite."

The fact, as we see it, in regard to Churches of Eastern origin is this. With the exception of the Assyrian Church, they belong to two ecclesiastical traditions, one accepting the Council of Chalcedon and the other rejecting it. For the sake of convenience, we shall refer to the former as "Chalcedonian" and to the latter as "non-Chalcedonian." The non-Chalcedonian group has existed in history consisting of five national Churches which are formally in communion one with another. It is true that, because of adverse historical circumstances, these Churches happened to be isolated both one from another and from the rest of Christendom. At the same time, the fact that they have kept alive the ancient Christian tradition in the geographical areas of their existence, and that from the point of view of numerical strength they are not a negligible part of Christendom, should have led scholars long ago to investigate the basis of their protest against Chalcedon. However, to the present day no scholar seems to have thought that these Eastern Churches deserve the kind of fair treatment which many in modern times have shown even in dealing with heresies of the ancient Church.

It is this fact that necessitates a fresh study of the Council of Chalcedon and the point of the non-Chalcedonian opposition to the Council.

In treating the Council of Chalcedon, we must have a clear understanding of the controversy that preceded it. That there had been two rival schools of theological thinking in the East, namely the schools of Alexandria and Antioch, is a fact known to any student of Church history. Of these two, it was the men of the former that scored a victory at the Council of Ephesus in 431. Till 433 the men of the latter refused to accept that Council. In 433, by the Concordat between Cyril of Alexandria and John of Antioch, there was formal acceptance of the Council of 431 by the entire Church. The Concordat, however, was not a real union. Many of the leading men of the Antiochene party took it only as a stepping stone to make all their theological assertions. This was opposed by the other party. It was in this context that the Home Synod of Constantinople in 448 condemned Eutyches, an old archimandrite of the Alexandrine party, as a heretic. In fact, heresy was ascribed to him on the ground that he refused to accept the Antiochene phrase "two natures after the union" and to condemn its opponents. This obviously was an attempt to declare exclusively orthodox the Antiochene theological position. Naturally it came to be opposed by the Alexandrine party under the leadership of Dioscorus, the immediate successor of Cyril in the Egyptian see. The point of Dioscorus was that the Antiochene phrase was heretical, and that the Alexandrine phrase "One incarnate nature of God the Word" alone was orthodox. On this ground and on the strength of a Confession of the Faith, to which no party in those ancient times saw reason to raise objection, the second Council of Ephesus in 449 acquitted Eutyches, and condemned as heretics both Flavian of Constantinople, the president of the Home Synod of 448, and Eusebius of Dorylaeum, the accuser of the old monk. Leo of Rome, whose Tome had not received a reading at this Council, renounced the Council as Latrocinium. His protests, however, were disregarded in the East till the death of emperor Theodosius II, whose support the Alexandrine party enjoyed. He died in 450 succeeded on the throne by his sister Pulcheria and her husband Marcian, who favoured Rome at the cost of Alexandria. In 451 the Council of Chalcedon met. Without even raising the specific issue, namely what, in the face of the two rival phrases, should be the Church's affirmation in regard to the Person of Jesus Christ, the Council ratified the decision of the Home Synod and condemned the Council of 449. In other words, Chalcedon confirmed the Antiochene position to the exclusion of the Alexandrine.

Though this truth of the matter alone is borne out by the available original documents connected with the Council, it was not admitted by the bishops who were present at Chalcedon, nor has it ever been given due attention in the long course of subsequent history. On the contrary, Chalcedonians of all ages have tried to make out that the Council of 451 was a direct continuation of the three earlier Councils recognised as authoritative, and that it made a doctrinal synthesis of all the principles of value contained in the various earlier traditions. This Chalcedonian claim has to be examined.

Speaking of a synthesis of theological principles, one point has to be specially mentioned in this context. In the Arian controversy of the fourth century the one man who stood unswervingly loyal to the Council of Nicea was Athanasius of Alexandria. The success which the Nicene cause came to enjoy was due mainly to his readiness to discuss theological principles with men who had difficulty on account of the terminology adopted by the Council. He did not condemn men as heretics merely on the ground that they found the Nicene phraseology unacceptable, but started his discussion with principles and defended the terms as a tool to conserve ideas. From this point of view, the age of Chalcedon evinced a spirit diametrically opposed to that of the Nicene age.

Neither at Chalcedon nor at any time thereafter was there a theological discussion between the two sides on the basis of principles. Chalcedon itself insisted on the phrase "in two natures," without ever making it clear what was meant by it. On this basic issue, the second Council of Constantinople in 553 made a few concessions to the non-Chalcedonians. But it was essentially a Chalcedonian attempt to draw more and more the Council's opponents to their side, and mere self-respect was enough motive for the non-Chalcedonians to laugh at it.

How, then, was the Council's Formula almost unanimously endorsed by several hundreds of the bishops present at Chalcedon? How does it come to be loyally defended by a vast majority in Christendom? Of these two questions, the first will be answered in our treatment of the Council. In regard to the second, a few points may be mentioned in the present context.

From the beginning, the Christological controversy happened to express itself as a conflict between the incumbents of the sees of Alexandria and Constantinople. Thus in the first phase of it the men who led the two sides were Cyril of Alexandria and Nestorius of Constantinople. Had not the latter decided to call in question the title Theotokos as applied to the Virgin, his opponent probably would not have won a historic success over him. Therefore, the rejection of Nestorius by the see of Constantinople should not be taken as an indication that the men of that see were untouched by a spirit of rivalry. In the second phase of the conflict, the dispute was clearly between the two sees. For it was a decision of the Home Synod of Constantinople that the second Council of Ephesus led by men of the Alexandrine party set aside, and the chief figure at the Council was Dioscorus of Alexandria. That Council did not only challenge the authority of the Constantinopolitan Home Synod, but it also condemned the archbishop of the Byzantine see. In that situation, Chalcedon was the scene of lasting triumph for the see of Constantinople. For it humiliated Dioscorus, the archbishop of Alexandria, and ratified the decisions of the Byzantine Home Synod. In addition to that, despite Western opposition, the Council of 451 elevated the see of Constantinople over the two historic major sees of the East, and assigned to it the same status in the East as Rome had in the West. This, in fact, was tantamount to removing all future possibilities of an attack on the Byzantine see by any other see in the East. It is to this earthly success that the see of Constantinople clings by upholding the Council of Chalcedon in the name of an "undivided Church."

This success, however, was scored at the cost of justice and equity. For, as we shall see later, behind the decisions of the Council of 449, there lay a theological emphasis, of which Chalcedon showed no understanding, and the treatment it rendered Dioscorus was colored by sheer hatred of the Alexandrine see.

In regard to the rivalry between the sees of Alexandria and Constantinople, the role played by the incumbents of the former from the days of Theophilus has been noted by scholars with imaginative exaggeration. But the fact that the men of the Byzantine see overreached at Chalcedon all the former "iniquities" of the Egyptian see, has never been recognised. The one see in Christendom which received most temporal benefit from the Council of Chalcedon was Constantinople.

Rome also had its share of the booty. The legates of the Western see at Chalcedon had hoped from the beginning that they could avail themselves of imperial support and the rivalry in the Eastern Church to declare the bishop of Rome the Supreme Head of the universal Church. In fact, they assumed this to be an established order in the Church, and continued to make assertions springing out of it.

However, the Roman claim sustained the severest blow possible by the passing of the 28th canon. This point needs a word of explanation. From very early times Rome had enjoyed a precedence of honour among the major sees in Christendom. According to the 28th canon of Chalcedon, such privileges had been conferred on Rome "on account of its character as the imperial city."[1] But early in the fifth century Innocent I had claimed, much before the Council of Chalcedon ever met, that St. Peter had been, by our Lord's own appointment, the Fountain of correct doctrine for the entire Church, and that, as his direct successor, the bishop of Rome was invested with the task of preserving it by a divine right.[2] Assertions springing out of this claim were seriously made at Chalcedon by the Roman legates. The 28th canon, however, reduced them to a mere puff of wind connoting nothing in reality.

All the same, Chalcedon was in other respects a victory for Rome. Doctrinally, the one man who won a glorious success at Chalcedon was Leo of Rome. For the Council declared his Tome a document of the Faith binding on the Church. This was done, in spite of the fact that its theology was either confused or granted only the position regarded in the East as the teaching of Nestorius. Chalcedon did not only accept the Tome of Leo, but went so far as to insert in the Definition of the Faith the words, "In two natures," the phrase crucial in that document--a phrase which would shock all Alexandrine conservative sentiment. In this way, at Chalcedon, Rome gained in theology what it lost in respect of earthly power and jurisdiction.

---

[1] Hefele: The History of the Church Councils, Eng. tr., III, p. 411.

[2] Burn-murdoch, H., The Development of the Papacy, p. 213.

Chalcedon was, therefore, the place of political victory for Constantinople and theological victory for Rome. Both these sees have, ever since, held on to the triumph which they secured, without even admitting the fact that their success cost the Church in history its unity, and ecclesiastical morals the principle of justice and equity which no man can afford to ignore.

Subsequent to the Council, the Byzantine emperors tried their best to enforce the decisions of the Council on the Church in the East. With the partial exception of a brief period between 482 and 518, until the Arab conquest of the Middle East, the acceptance of the Council was the only guarantee for state protection to Churchmen. In the midst of innumerable adversities verging on persecution the non-Chalcedonian section of the Church continued in its protest. The unswerving loyalty to the Council expressed by the two major sees in Christendom under the mighty support of the state raised the Confession of Chalcedon to the status of the Faith of conformity. Along with this triumph, Chalcedonians, in order to make out that they were exclusively the Church, continued to misrepresent the non-Chalcedonians as "monophysite" heretics. The fact, however, is that from 451 on the latter had been making it clear that their position was not "monophysite," and that they went on answering Chalcedonian criticisms against them. This they did by developing the Alexandrine theological position, incorporating into it principles contained in the Antiochene way of thinking. The Christology of Severus of Antioch which forms the second part of this study is an able presentation of that synthesis. Contemporaneous with this development on the non-Chalcedonian side, there was an effort on the Chalcedonian side to interpret the Council's Definition along the lines of the Alexandrine tradition. This movement found its fullest expression in olden days in the Christology of Leontius of Byzantium, who wrote, in all probability, after Severus.

On the strength of these facts, one can say that, in regard to the Person of Jesus Christ, there exist in Christian tradition two theological syntheses of earlier ways of thinking which go back to the age after Chalcedon. We shall be concerned chiefly with the one developed by Severus. At the same time, we shall give some attention to its relation to that of Leontius, and to these questions:

1. What is the fundamental difference between the two?

2. Of the two, which one deserves to be considered a better Christological interpretation?

For an objective understanding of the non-Chalcedonian position, we have to start our study from the way in which Dioscorus of Alexandria was treated at the Council of Chalcedon.

Part One

The Non-Chalcedonian Opposition to the Council of Chalcedon

Chapter One

Charge Against Dioscorus

The non-Chalcedonian movement goes back to the protest against the Council of 451 expressed by Dioscorus. This Council is reputed to have deposed him. But a section of the Eastern Church venerates him even today as an ecclesiastical dignitary who stood for the maintenance of orthodoxy as interpreted by earlier authoritative Councils and Church fathers. In the face of this fact, it is necessary to examine why and how Dioscorus was deposed. We may begin by outlining the events that led to his deposition.

In 448, at the Home Synod of Constantinople, presided over by Flavian, the archbishop of that see, Eusebius of Dorylaeum accused Eutyches, an archimandrite, of holding heretical views. After the customary procedure, the monk was condemned. An ascetic held in high esteem at the court of Emperor Theodosius II and venerated by large sections of people, Eutyches showed himself unwilling to abide by an ecclesiastical censure of this kind. With high hopes that the sentence would be set aside, he appealed to the bishops of Rome and Alexandria. Leo I, the archbishop of the Western see, received in addition an official report of the Synod's proceedings. Contrary to Eutyches's expectations, Leo found himself in agreement with the decision of the Home Synod, and he wrote his famous Tome, dealing with the subject at issue, and probably determined to see that his writing was declared a document of the Faith binding on the Church. The Tome was sent to Flavian and was well received. Dioscorus, the incumbent of the Alexandrine see, reacted differently. Not being disposed to endorse the condemnation of Eutyches, he defended the archimandrite. In 449 a Council of about a hundred and fifty bishops met at Ephesus. This Council rehabilitated Eutyches, and deposed on a charge of heresy both Flavian and Eusebius. The leading figure at this assembly was Dioscorus. Both Rome and a considerable section of the East protested against these decisions. As the emperor gave his ungrudging support to the Council, the victorious party remained on its pedestal of glory till the emperor's death in 450. Theodosius II was succeeded by his sister Pulcheria and her husband Marcian. The unfriendly relation that had existed between the imperial brother and sister had already led the latter to favour the party opposed to the Alexandrines whom the former had been mightily supporting. And, when she came to power, it was made clear that her patronage was going to be in favour of Rome, not of Alexandria. In 451 the Council of Chalcedon met. Under the control of the imperial Commissioners appointed by the emperor and the empress and guided by the Roman legates, this Council reversed the decisions of Ephesus. It condemned Eutyches as a heretic, and acquitted Flavian, who was now dead, and Eusebius. The triumphant party at the Council managed to do away with Dioscorus by a sentence of deposition. Having declared the *Tome* of Leo an orthodox document of the Faith, the Council drew up a doctrinal formula in consonance with its language and ideas. Even the bishops who had been friends and colleagues of Dioscorus at Ephesus and who had remained in his fellowship till the Council of Chalcedon met, now deserted him one after another. Thus isolated from friends and denounced by opponents, the bishop of Alexandria fought a lonely battle. As he refused to conform to the doctrinal statement drawn up by the Council, he was exiled to Gangra where he breathed his last.

On the strength of these events, certain conclusions have been drawn. (a) Dioscorus defended Eutyches because their theological position was the same. (b) This is the ground on which he was deposed. (c) This again is the reason why he refused to accept the Chalcedonian Formula of the Faith. (d) In venerating Dioscorus, the non-Chalcedonian section of the Church is guilty of perpetuating the memory of a heretic. Therefore, even if it be shown that their theological position, as developed later, comprehends all principles of orthodoxy, the fact remains that its origins had been in heresy.

Basic to all these conclusions is the first, and we shall examine how far it is grounded in facts. That the events we have sketched can with some plausibility be taken as a basis for drawing it, is beyond doubt. But it has more problems than has generally been recognized.

The old archimandrite had never claimed to be a theologian.[1] In fact, had it not been for the rivalry between the Antiochene and the Alexandrine theologians, even if there were sufficient grounds for regarding him as a heretic, he did not deserve as much notice as Marcellus of Ancyra had elicited from Nicene leaders a century earlier.[1] One might unhesitatingly say that, whether actually the views held and expressed by Eutyches were sound or unsound, this theologically unqualified monk was suffering more for the sin of the age than for any heretical notions. We have, as we shall see later, no evidence that Eutyches had held the views attributed to him. The fact, therefore, is that the appellation "Eutychianism" is a misnomer, for what it connotes had been read into it by abler minds than Eutyches.

---

[1] An admirer of Cyril of Alexandria, Eutyches had learned from his master certain theological phrases. In the conflict between the theologians of the Antiochene and the Alexandrine ways of thinking he always supported the latter against the former. The favour he enjoyed at the court of Theodosius II enabled him to be enough of a trouble-maker for the Antiochenes (See Kidd: A History of the Church to A.D. 461, III, pp. 288-294).

His trial at the Home Synod of Constantinople in 448 has shown (the minutes of his trial as read at the second Council of Ephesus in 449 and at the Council of Chalcedon in 451 are found in Mansi VI 729-748, and are reproduced below pp. 34f.) that he was not a theologian, and that his theological knowledge was limited to an acquaintance with certain phrases. Therefore, even if he had held the views ascribed to him, to class him with Paul of Samosata, Arius, Apollinarius, and others like them, is no compliment to those able minds.

Dioscorus, on the other hand, was the immediate successor of the great Cyril, whose fame as a theologian had to be recognised even by the Council of Chalcedon. If he is to be considered a "Eutychian," one has to say that either the vague notions ascribed to the old monk had been originated by Cyril himself, or Dioscorus had learned no theology from his illustrious predecessor. None of the serious minded scholars would grant the first alternative. The second is not in itself improbable; for it could be that Dioscorus, like Eutyches, had learned only certain phrases from Cyril. Those who regard him as a "Eutychian" must, in fact, be proceeding on this assumption. However, there are at least three considerations against it.

---

[1] Marcellus of Ancyra had actually brought ridicule on the Nicenes by giving expression to views which were far from orthodox. At least Athanasius had never cared to trouble him.

I. This charge is not based on any writing that can be ascribed to him, or any reported saying of his, or even on the verdict of the bishops at Chalcedon who deposed him. It is true that, unlike his predecessor, he has not left behind him many writings, and that whatever has come down to us remains only in fragments. This, certainly, was not the case at the time when he was deposed. From 444 to 450 he was the unquestioned leader of the Alexandrine party, and he had the normal capacity to use his tongue. As the leader of opposition against the Antiochenes, he had expounded his understanding of the Faith. However, his opponents never put their finger on any statement of his to prove that he was a heretic. Not only this; it was his insistent demand at Chalcedon that the subject of the Faith be taken up before investigation on personal charges be allowed.[1] In fact, the charge of "Eutychian" learnings was made against him by Eusebius of Doryleum and the Oriental bishops asserted that he was a "Eutychian." Even his accuser did not produce any written or uttered statement of Dioscorus to prove his point. On the other hand, his ground was a particular interpretation of the events. In response to allegations of this kind, Dioscorus made several statements at the Council, which remain recorded in its *Acts*. So also the *Acts* contain a number of his sayings uttered before he was deposed. All these are dignified words of a man with confidence that he was standing for certain principles, and that he had every right to question the very legality of the way he was being treated.[1]

---

[1] Mansi VI 586.

The charge of Eusebius was that Dioscorus was ὁμόδοξας of Eutyches.[2] In considering this allegation we must bear in mind that Eusebius had reasons for a grievous complaint against Dioscorus. As the accuser of Eutyches at the Home Synod of Constantinople in 448, the former had been feeling gratified at the detection of a second heresy;[3] but to his disillusionment he found himself deposed and the victim of his accusation acquitted at the second Council of Ephesus. Eusebius believed that it was the work of Dioscorus and was waiting for an opportunity, so to say, to repay his adversary in the same coin. The Council of Chalcedon provided that, and Eusebius was determined to take full advantage of it.

---

[1] For a lucid summary account of his deposition coming from the pen of a sixth century Chalcedonian historian, see Evagrius: *Ecclesiastical History* (Eng. tr.), pp. 94-101). For an account based on Mansi, see below pp. 127-141.

[2] Mansi VI 584. Eusebius asserted that Dioscorus ὁμόδοξον ὢν, καὶ ὁμόφρων Εὐτυχοῦς τοῦ ματαιόφρονος, καὶ αἱρετικοῦ.

[3] As a layman Eusebius had accused Nestorius of heresy at the beginning of the controversy over the title *Theotokos* as applied to the Virgin. Without in any way trying to justify the second Council of Ephesus, one can say that this bishop was led more by a grudge against Dioscorus in accusing him than by facts. We shall see later that he made the charge twice.

As we shall see in the next chapter, Dioscorus was deposed by a special meeting of a section of the bishops presided over by Paschasinus, the chief of the Roman delegation to the Council. Before this gathering passed its verdict on the bishop of Alexandria, the Roman legates made a declaration.[1] On the charge of "Eutychianism" against Dioscorus, it contains these words:

> For not to mention the mass of offences, he did, on his own authority, uncanonically admit to communion his partisan (τὸν ὁμόδοξον αὐτῷ) Eutyches, after the latter had been canonically deposed by his own bishop.[2]

---

[1] For the full declaration, see below pp. 138-140.

[2] Mansi VI 1045. The charge is that Εὐτυχῆ τὸν ὁμόδοξον αὐτῷ As we have seen (above p. 22), Eusebius charged Dioscorus with having been ὁμόδοξος of Eutyches. The Roman legates softened it and said that Eutyches was ὁμόδοξος of Dioscorus. So the argument of Eusebius is that Eutyches is a heretic; therefore, Dioscorus, his ὁμόδοξος , must be a heretic too. But for the Roman legates, Dioscorus is a heretic, because Eutyches, one of his ὁμοίδοξος is a heretic. Marcellus of Ancyra was a ὁμοδοξος of Athanasius and the Nicenes. However, on that ground, nobody would regard the latter as fellows in the former's heresy.

The Roman legates try to link up Dioscorus with Eutyches in two ways. On the one hand, the monk is spoken of as a ὁμόδοξος of Dioscorus; and on the other, notwithstanding the action of the Constantinopolitan Home Synod, the bishop of Alexandria is said to have offered him communion. Regarding the first, Eutyches was a follower of the Alexandrine tradition, and as such he was a ὁμόδοξος of Dioscorus. This, however, does not mean that the successor of Cyril in the great see of Alexandria had, in his theological position, comprehended only the hazy notions ascribed to the old monk.

As for the second, there are two points to be observed. The charge in the words of the Roman legates is that Dioscorus ἀκανονίστος εἰς κοινωνίαν ἐδέξατο Eutyches. (a) What does this actually mean? (b) How far is this charge based on facts?

(a) That the term κοινωνία may mean Eucharistic fellowship cannot be doubted. If it meant that, as most scholars[1] seem to take it, Dioscorus defied a cardinal principle of the unity of the Church. For he was certainly wrong, if he actually received Eutyches into the Eucharistic fellowship, prior to his rehabilitation by the second Council of Ephesus. But the point to be noted is that, if the statement of the Roman legates meant that, Leo was as much in the wrong as Dioscorus. For, in connection with the restoration of Theodoret of Cyrus by the Council of Chalcedon, the Roman legates stated that, on the strength of the former's correspondence to Leo making it clear that he condemned both Nestorius and Eutyches and held to the orthodox Faith, μακαριώτατος πάσης ἐκκλησίας ἐπίσκοπος πόλεως ῥώμης Λέων πάλιν εἰς κοινωνίαν ἐδέξατο.[1] It must be remembered that Theodoret had been deposed by the second Council of Ephesus.[2] Subsequently he appealed to Leo, granting even the latter's claim of supremacy for his see.[3] Eager to vent his fury on Dioscorus, who, he believed, had slighted his see by not allowing the reading of his Tome at Ephesus, Leo "restored him to the Episcopate"[4] on his own authority.

---

[1] Kidd takes it in the sense of Eucharistic fellowship, and argues that Dioscorus was guilty of offence against Catholic unity (*op. cit.* p. 320 n. 8). According to Hefele, "Dioscorus now went so far that, in opposition to all canonical laws, he received Eutyches back into the communion of the Church" (*History of the Church Councils* (Eng. tr.) III, p. 221.) In his recent work, *The Council of Chalcedon*, R. V. Sellers expresses his reading that "the reply of Dioscorus was to receive Eutyches into his communion" (p. 73). Obviously, these two scholars also take κοινωνία in the sense of Eucharistic fellowship.

---

[1] Mansi VII 189-192.

[2] The second Council of Ephesus was intended to be a Council of the entire Church and as such it had jurisdiction over Theodoret. The question whether or not that Council's decisions were acceptable was for a similar Council to take up.

[3] Kidd: op. cit. pp. 307-308. See below pp. 62-65.

[4] Ibid. p. 316.

Here again we have to make two comments: One: In the case of Theodoret did the expression εἰς κοινωνίαν ἐδέξατο mean Eucharistic fellowship? Were the Roman legates stating that between the year 449 and 451 Theodoret and either Leo himself or his representatives had it with each other?[1] Two: If that is what is meant here, how can Dioscorus be penalised for a similar action?[2]

There is a more conclusive evidence against taking the expression εἰς κοινωνίαν ἐδέξατο in the sense of Eucharistic fellowship. As we shall see later, the Roman legates stated about the colleagues of Dioscorus at the second Ephesian Council that Leo ἐν τῆ ἑαυτοῦ κοινωνίᾳ ὁμοπίστους ἐδέξατο[3] In whatever sense the term κοινωνία is taken, this statement is flagrantly untrue to facts. We shall try to show that later. The point to be made in the present context is that none of those men were likely to have had Eucharistic fellowship with Leo or his representatives between 449 and 451. Therefore, the expression means here only defence of the men concerned. If it meant more than that, both Leo and Dioscorus were equally guilty of violating the principle of Catholic unity.

---

[1] According to a tradition preserved by Zacharias of Mitylene, "Theodoret went up to Leo of Rome, and informed him about all these matters; and, with gifts which blinds the eyes of the soul, he got the better of him" (The Chronicle Eng. tr. p. 42.). If this is trustworthy, Leo broke Catholic unity, and showed himself a partisan in the conflict.

[2] The only precedent which would give Leo the semblance of a prerogative over Dioscorus on a point like this is the canon of Sardica. Even if it is argued that that canon had a binding authority on the Church in the fifth century, it gave Leo the right only to convene a Council to look into the case of Theodoret.

[3] See below pp. 140.

(b) This charge was not found in the suit of Eusebius against Dioscorus; neither was it made by any Eastern bishop present at the Council during the investigation of the charges. The declaration of the Roman legates to which we have referred was, what we may call, part of the verdict of the jury on the accused. They took that opportunity to add from their own a charge which had not been part of the original suit. The other bishops present who gave their verdict in the same capacity did not refer to this new charge, nor did they indicate any knowledge of it. Had Dioscorus actually received Eutyches into the Eucharistic fellowship of the Church, there is no reason why the Eastern neighbours of the bishop of Alexandria keep quiet over it. It is, therefore, very likely that the Roman legates, who understood law more sharply than their Eastern partisans, saw the impossibility of proving a charge of heresy against Dioscorus, and in their determination to overthrow their master's enemy, put their emphasis on the defence of Eutyches which the bishop of Alexandria had offered. In any case, the error of Dioscorus was not graver than that of Leo.

We have, therefore, to conclude that at Chalcedon there was a charge of "Eutychian" leaningings against Dioscorus. However, his accuser had no evidence to prove his case, except by interpreting certain events in a particular way. The Roman legates, who were literally bent upon degrading Dioscorus, had to soften the charge and be satisfied with a statement of the fact that he defended Eutyches.

After the declaration of the Roman legates portraying the bishop of Alexandria as the worst problem child the Roman see had ever had to handle, and after an expression of views by the other bishops, the special meeting of Churchmen which was constrained to take up the case of Dioscorus came out with its verdict. It reads as follows:

> On account of contempt of the sacred canons, and thy contumacy regarding this holy and universal synod, inasmuch as, in addition to the other offences of which thou hast been convicted, thou didst not appear, even when summoned the third time by this great and holy synod, according to the sacred canons in order to reply to the charges made against thee; know then that thou hast been deposed from thy bishoprick, on the thirteenth day of this present month, October, by the holy and universal synod, and deprived of all ecclesiastical rank.[1]

In this verdict there is no mention of heresy or "Eutychian" leanings against Dioscorus. One might say that the clause "the other offences of which thou hast been convicted" implies it, or that, since Dioscorus did not obey the summons of the Council, no mention of heresy was necessary. It must be remembered that these bishops were determined to undermine the bishop of Alexandria. If they had any means of proving a charge of heresy against him, they would have done everything in their power to bring it out clearly. Therefore, in all probability they had no evidence to penalise him as a heretic. To condemn a man in his absence was nothing new in the history of the Church. The cases of Paul of Samosata more than a century and a half earlier and of Nestorius twenty years before had been so dealt with. However, in both cases the Councils that arrived at the respective decisions took in evidence the writings of the men and passed their verdicts. As we shall see in the next section, Dioscorus absented himself from a gathering of enemies on grounds which, in his judgment, were sufficient to act the way he did.

---

[1] Evag. op. cit. p. 101. Mansi VI 1093-1096.

The fact that Dioscorus was not condemned on any charge of heresy was the belief of even his enemies at Chalcedon. For this we have the testimony of Anatolius of Constantinople himself. Though this worthy was raised to that see by the second Council of Ephesus, and though

---

[1] See the next Chapter.

he remained on the side of Dioscorus till the death of Theodosius II in 450, subsequently he made common cause with Leo,[1] and continued to be the Roman bishop's right hand man in the East. His testimony cannot have, therefore, come out of a love for Dioscorus. Not only that, he was one of the leading figures at the special gathering of bishops which deposed Dioscorus,[2] and as such his statement about the bishop of Alexandria cannot be dismissed as having been irresponsibly made.

At the fourth session of the Council[3] the subject of deliberation was a Formula of the Faith to be adopted by the assembly. Asclepiades,[4] a deacon of Constantinople, had submitted a draft statement for adoption by the Council. On this there was difference of opinion among the assembled bishops, and in the course of the debate that ensued, the Commissioners pointed out: "Dioscorus has affirmed that he deposed Flavian because the latter had asserted two natures; whereas the formulary contains 'of two natures.'" The Commissioners obviously wanted it to be replaced by "in two natures." Anatolius, however, was not in favour of this new phrase, and answered: "Dioscorus has not been deposed on a point of faith, but because he has excommunicated the Lord archbishop Leo, and though thrice summoned did not appear."[1] Not one of the assembled bishops, including the Roman legates and the Antiochenes, ventured to challenge Anatolius on this point. We must specially note that the bishop of Constantinople not only regarded Dioscorus as orthodox, but, in defining the Faith, he was defending the expression endorsed by the bishop of Alexandria. In other words, though Anatolius accepted the expression "in two natures" before the end of the fourth session of the Council on October 22, he came to the assembly on that day determined to fight for "of two natures." So even in the course of the nine days between the deposition of Dioscorus and this fourth session of the Council the story that he had been anathematised on a charge of heresy had not either been told at all or Anatolius had given no credence to it.

---

[1] For an account of his change, see Kidd: op. cit. p. 312.

[2] Immediately after the declaration of the Roman legates, it was Anatolius who expressed his view regarding Dioscorus. His statement was: τὰ αὐτὰ τῶ Ἀποστολικῶ θρόνω διὰ πάντων φρονῶν, σύμψηφος κἀγὼ γίνομαι ἐπὶ τῇ καθαιρέσει Διοσκόρου, τοῦ γινομένου ἐπισκόπου τῆς Ἀλεξανδρέων μεγαλοπόλεως ἑαυτὸν πάσης ἱερατικῆς λειτουργίας ἀλλότριον ἀποδείξαντος, διὰ τὸ ἐν ἅπασιν ἀπειθῆσαι τοῖς τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων κανόσι, καὶ τρίτον κανονικῶς κληθέντα, καὶ μὴ ὑποκοῦσαι θελήσαντα

[3] For our reasons for taking this session as the fourth, and not as the fifth, see below pp. 118-120.

[4] Mansi VII 104.

---

[1] This incident is treated in detail in the third chapter of this study.

We have to conclude, therefore, that there is not a shred of evidence to say that Dioscorus was deposed on a charge of heresy. Neither his determined enemies who manoevred to bring about his overthrow, nor his fickle-minded partisans who ignobly deserted him, had believed that he was a heretic of any description. The tale that he was deposed on a charge of "Eutychianism" must, therefore, be a later invention of Chalcedonians. Believing, as they did, that the Church in history cannot be divided, they had to account for the fact that it was actually divided. Naturally they invented the tale that the Council of Chalcedon deposed Dioscorus on a charge of heresy, and that the non-Chalcedonian section of the Church which continued to venerate him was nothing but a heretical sect.

II. The second consideration against regarding Dioscorus as a "Eutychian" is a statement which he made at the Council of Chalcedon. In answer to the accusation of Eusebius of Dorylaeum and the shouts of Antiochenes that he was a "Eutychian," the bishop of Alexandria is reported to have spoken these words: "If Eutyches holds notions disallowed by the doctrines of the Church, he deserves, not only punishment, but even fire. My concern is, however, for the catholic and apostolic Faith, not for any man whomsoever."[1] These are the dignified words of a man who regarded orthodoxy in terms of the tradition of the Church. He was not apologetic for any one. In the face of this unassailable stand of the bishop of Alexandria, if the assembled bishops had any suspicion regarding his orthodoxy, they would have tried in all possible ways to bring out that fact. As we have already noted, it was the demand of Dioscorus that the subject of the Faith should be taken up and decided before the minutes of the second Ephesian Council were allowed to be read. This demand was denied on a legal point, the morality of which was questionable.[2] In the light of available documents we have to say that the powerful party at the Council was determined to discredit Dioscorus, and then to take up the subject of the Faith.

In this context one question demands an answer. Was Dioscorus loyal to the "catholic and apostolic faith" when he defended Eutyches? The second Council of Ephesus had acquitted Eutyches on the strength of a confession of Faith which he presented, and also by judging the ground of his condemnation by the Constantinopolitan Home Synod as an innovation in the Faith. In order to bring out the Council's point, we have to examine the minutes of the Home Synod as it was read at Ephesus as well as at Chalcedon,[1] and also to look into the Confession of the old monk as is found in his statement of the Faith.

---

[1] Mansi VI 633. See below pp. 80-81 for the context in which it was spoken.

[2] See below pp. 61f.

The trial started with the reading of the following passage from the Formulary of Reunion of 433.[2]

> We, therefore, confess that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Only-begotten Son of God is perfect God and perfect man of a rational soul and body. Before (the) ages He was born of the Father according to Godhead, and at the end of days He, for us and for our salvation, was born of Mary the Virgin according to manhood. He is the same substance (ὁμοούσιον) with the Father according to Godhead and of the same substance with us according to manhood. The two natures came into a union. Wherefore we confess one Christ and one Lord. Since God the Word became incarnate and man, because of the unconfused union, we confess the Virgin to be Theotokos. For He assumed from her a temple from His conception.[3]

Now Eusebius of Dorylaeum intervened, exclaiming, "This is what this man does not confess. He has never accepted this, but has been holding views opposed to it and been teaching them to people who came to him." When, however, it came to the formal stating of the charge, Eusebius began to waver, and needed the assurance of Flavian that the monk's favour at the court or his popularity would not create problems for him. After this was given, Eusebius framed the charge in this way: "Does he accept what is read from the blessed Cyril and confess that two natures (δύο φύσεις) have united in one (ἑνὶ) prosopon and one (μία) hypostasis, yes or no?"

---

[1] The minutes of the Home Synod, as is reproduced here almost in full, are to be found in Mansi VI 729-748.

[2] For a discussion of this document, see below pp. 181-7.

[3] This passage is from the statement of John of Antioch sent to Cyril, which the latter incorporated into the Formulary of Reunion.

Flavian now called upon Eutyches to answer questions based on the charge.

Flavian: Do you confess that there was a union of two natures (ἐκ δύο φύσεων)?

Eutyches: Yes, I do; of two natures (ἐκ δύο φύσεων).

Eusebius apparently was not satisfied with the question. So he asked, bringing out his point more clearly: "Do you confess two natures (δύο φύσεις), my Lord archimandrite, after the Humanisation (ἐνανθρωπήσιν), and do you affirm that Christ was according to flesh of the same substance (ὁμοούσιον) with us; yes or no?"[1]

---

[1] If we compare the two questions of Eusebius, we shall notice that he started with the simple Cyrilline affirmation. Finding it to be congruous with what Eutyches was willing to admit, he was trying to make out as the one accepted norm of orthodoxy the full-fledged Antiochene phrase δύο φύσεις μετὰ τὴν ενανθρωπήσιν or ενώσιν , a phrase which was the crux of the dispute between the Antiochenes and the Alexandrines for about two decades.

In answer to Eusebius, Eutyches said: "I have not come to argue with your piety, but to learn. So saying, he held forth a paper which, he said, contained his confession of the Faith, and required it to be read. As he was not willing to read it himself, and as nobody wanted it to be read, it was not taken into consideration.[1] In response to the demand that he should state his belief, he spoke: "Thus I believe--I worship the Father with the Son, and the Son with the Father, and the Holy Spirit with

---

Therefore, it was not surprising that, when this question was read at Ephesus, "the Holy Synod said: 'Take, burn Eusebius. He should be burnt alive. He should be divided, as he divided.'" At this expression of outspoken disapproval, Dioscorus asked the Council, "Does it seem to you fitting to affirm this phrase, namely 'two natures after the Humanisation'(δύο φύσεις μετὰ τὴν ἐνανθρώπησιν)?" The Council answered, "Anathema to him who affirms (that)."
Dioscorus: "I want your voices as well as your hands. He who cannot shout, let him show forth his hands."
The Council: "If any one says two, let him be anathema."

This account of what had happened at Ephesus in 449 was read at Chalcedon. The Oriental bishops and their party (namely the Antiochenes) tried to make out that no anathema had been pronounced on the phrase "two natures after the union." They shouted: "Nobody said these (things). Dioscorus said these, (things). The Egyptians said these (things)."
The Egyptians retorted: "We said these (things) at that time, and we still say them."

[1] That the written confession of Eutyches was not read at the Synod is surprising. Did the bishops think that it was not his own confession, and that he would go back on it later?

the Father and the Son. Concerning His coming in the flesh, I confess that it happened from the flesh of the Virgin, and that He became man perfectly (τελείως) for our salvation. This I believe in the presence of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, and of your Holiness."[1]

Flavian: Do you confess that our Lord Jesus Christ is of the same substance with His Father according to Godhead, and of the same substance with us according to manhood?

Eutyches: I have already stated to your Holiness how I believe in the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. There is no further need for my being examined.

Flavian: Now, do you confess "of two natures" ἐκ δύο φύσεων ?

Eutyches: Since I confess my God to be the Lord of heaven and earth, I have not till this day let myself enquire into His nature. That He is of the same substance with us, I have not affirmed till now. I confess.

---

[1] In this statement, Eutyches has affirmed a real Incarnation. According to him, God assumed flesh from the flesh of the Virgin, and became man perfectly. In the context the term "perfectly"(τελείως) means that God, in His perfection, assumed a perfect human life. This statement may be compared with Eusebius' accusation against Eutyches at Chalcedon (below pp.

When this was read at Ephesus, Dioscorus said: "We accept this idea." The Council assented: "This is the Faith of the fathers." Dioscorus asked: "What is the Faith of the fathers? Make it clear." The Council said: "That of Eutyches; for Eusebius is ungodly." Dioscorus: "Have you heard the Faith of Eutyches, the archimandrite? It is clear to all of you what has happened."

Flavian: Do you not say "of the same substance with the Father" and "of the same substance with us"?

Eutyches: Till this day I have not said concerning the body of the Lord that it is of the same substance with us; but that the Virgin is of the same substance with us, I confess.

Flavian: The Virgin from whom our Lord Christ was incarnate is of the same substance with us.

Eutyches: The Virgin is of the same substance with us.

Basil of Seleucia: If the mother is of the same substance with us, He also is of the same substance with us. For He is called the Son of Man. If the mother is of the same substance with us, the Son is also of the same substance with us according to flesh.

Eutyches: As you say now, I agree in everything.

Florentius:[1] Do you say of the Lord that He is of the same substance with us and that He is two natures (δύο φύσεις) of Mary, yes or no?

Eutyches: I confess our Lord before the union to be of two natures (ἐκ δύο φύσεων); but after the union, I confess one nature (μία φύσις).[1]

---

[1] Florentius was the officer appointed by emperor Theodosius to be present at the trial of Eutyches.

The Synod: You ought clearly to confess the dogmas now read, and to anathematise all those who hold opposite views.

Eutyches: I am saying to your Holiness what I have not been saying previously. I am saying it because your Holiness so teaches and because I obey the fathers. But I have not found this in the Scriptures, nor have the fathers said all these (things). How, then, shall I anathematise? Woe unto me, if I pronounce anathema on the fathers."

---

[1] When the answer of Eutyches was read at Ephesus, Dioscorus stated, "This we believe, all of us." The Council assented. "Yes, we believe."

At Chalcedon there was a good deal of commotion on this point. "No one said these (things). These ideas are of the Egyptians. These our views to the emperor. Many years to the emperor. Many years to the empress. Many years to the senate," shouted the Antiochene party.

Eustathius of Berytus: The vigilance of the emperor, the vigilance of the empress, as well as your vigilance desire the unity of the churches. Without it may we not go from here. What do the commissioners say? To dogmatise and say two natures after the union is to divide.

Basil of Seleucia: We distinguish the two natures, without separating them. We speak neither of separation nor of confusion. (We shall see more of these two bishops later).

Now the commissioners asked for the rest of the minutes to be read.

The Synod now stood up and cried out saying, "Let him be anathema." As president, Flavian proceeded to ratify the mind of the assembly. "Let the Synod say what he deserves. For he has gone astray. He has neither confessed the orthodox faith correctly, nor is he disposed to conform to the Synod in the ideas which it holds; but he persists in perversion and his views are evil."

Seleucus of Amasea: "He deserves to be anathematised. . . ."

Flavian: If he abandons his mistake, agreeing to condemn his teaching, and conforms to us in holding the definition of the fathers, he shall be deemed worthy of pardon. If he persists in perversion, he shall fall under the jurisdiction of the canon law.

Eutyches: These I say now because your Holiness has commanded me to do so. But I will not anathematise. What I say, I say in truth.

Florentius: Do you affirm two natures (δύο φύσεις) and "of the same substance with us(ὁμοούσιον ἡμῖν).say?

Eutyches: I have read the blessed Cyril, the holy fathers and the holy Athanasius. They speak of two natures before the union. After the union and the Incarnation, they no longer affirm two natures, but one (μίαν).

Florentius: Do you confess "two natures after the union," say?

Eutyches: Command that the writings of Athanasius be read, so that you may know that he has never spoken in this way.

Basil of Seleucia: If you do not affirm two natures after the union, you are speaking of mixture and confusion.[1]

Florentius: He who does not affirm "of two natures" (ἐκ δύο φύσεων) and "two natures" (δύο φύσεις), does not have the correct faith.

The Synod again stood up and cried out, "That which comes from persuasion is not faith. Many years to the emperor. . . . As president, Flavian gave the verdict. The reason for the decision was given in this way. "It has been clearly brought to light that Eutyches, formerly presbyter and archimandrite, maintains the false doctrines of Valentinus and Apollinarius."

This is our only ground for holding that Eutyches was a heretic and that Dioscorus was a "Eutychian." The judgment on Dioscorus is based on the acquittal of Eutyches pronounced by the Council of 449. As we have noted, that Council took in evidence a confession of the Faith presented by Eutyches in addition to the minutes of the Home Synod of Constantinople. Before we take up that confession of the Faith, we shall look briefly into the way in which his theological position came to be characterised by the Tome of Leo and the Definitio of Chalcedon.

---

[1] When this was read at Chalcedon, Basil denied that he ever spoke this. "I affirm of the Lord that He was "of two natures," he said, "but after the union 'one nature' (μία φύσις). I know, I said these (things) in order to show that the Incarnation and the Humanisation was not mixture or confusion."

Juvenal of Jerusalem: "This statement has, therefore, been falsified, has it?"

Basil: I do not remember; I do not know whether I spoke (thus).

The bishop of Rome tries to make out that Eutyches perverted the credal statement,

> I believe in God the Father Omnipotent, and in Jesus Christ His Only Son our Lord, who was born of the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary.[1]

This statement, Leo makes clear, means that the Son who is co-eternal with the Father "was born of the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary." Eutyches, argues Leo, while "using deceptive words," says that "the Word was made Flesh, in such wise as to imply that Christ, having been conceived in the Virgin's womb, possessed the form of a man without a real body taken from His mother."

But the faith of Eutyches as borne out by his trial may be thus summarised. The eternal Son of God Himself, was born as man from the Virgin. His body or flesh was assumed from the body or flesh of the Virgin herself. Since, however, it was made His own by God, though it was truly a human body, it was different from any other human body. The ground for his hesitation in accepting the phrase "of the same substance with us" must have been this emphasis. As he readily granted that the Virgin was of the same substance with us, that He was also of the same substance with us was accepted by him. Obviously, his reluctance in accepting this phrase was not because for him the manhood was absorbed by the Godhead, but because it was manhood made His own by God.

---

[1] For the Tome, see T. H. Bindley: The Oecumenical Documents of the Faith, pp. 224-231.

All the same, it has to be admitted that his hesitation on this point was not commendable. However, the reason for his condemnation by the Home Synod and his denunciation by Leo lies somewhere else. He was asked to do three things. (a) To affirm the phrase "of the same substance with us." (b) To accept the Antiochene expression "two natures after the union." And (c) to condemn those who would not accept them. Of these three, he accepted the first with some reluctance. But the other two he categorically refused to do. Therefore, the one theological ground on which he was condemned lay, not in his hesitation to accept the phrase "of the same substance with us," but his refusal to endorse the Antiochene expression "two natures after the union," and his unwillingness to anathematise men who would not use it. In other words, the Home Synod of Constantinople assumed that the Antiochene phrase was exclusively orthodox, and that those opposed to it were heretics. In the historical context, this assumption was unjustifiable. We may go on to say that it is unjustifiable even today, because the insistence on that phrase at Chalcedon broke the unity of the Church, and because ever since Chalcedon the Church could not fix one norm of orthodoxy on any universally acceptable terminology.

It is true that the second Council of Ephesus bungled over the question raised by the phrase "of the same substance with us." The idea signified by this phrase and the phrase itself were central to the theology of Dioscorus.[1] At Ephesus the bishops were more concerned to keep out "two natures" than to alert the old monk on the phrase "of the same substance with us." This certainly is to be deplored. At the same time, it must be remembered that the idea which Eutyches was trying falteringly to conserve was made central to their theology by sixth century Chalcedonians. For, according to both Sergius the Grammarian and Leontius of Byzantium, Christ's manhood, though it was of the same substance with us, was also different from our manhood.[2]

---

[1] See below pp. 174f.

[2] For both these defenders of Chalcedon, Christ's manhood was different from our manhood, not merely by being sinless but also in its metaphysical status. (See below pp. 417f. and pp. 438f.)

Leo's misinterpretation of the phrases "of two natures" and "one incarnate nature" is rather intolerable. As we have seen in the minutes of the Home Synod, it was Flavian who first used the former, and enquired of Eutyches if he accepted it. Leo however, represents Eutyches to have said: "I confess that our Lord was from two natures before the Union, but after the Union I admit *but* One Nature."[1] Following Leo, the Council of Chalcedon also stated in its *Definitio* that

> it anathematises those who imagine Two Natures of the Lord before the Union, but fashion anew One Nature after the Union.[2]

In both these quotations the statement of Eutyches has been deplorably twisted.[1] This has been done in order to make out that, unless the expression "two natures after 'the union'" was accepted, heresy would be the unavoidable consequence. The second Council of Ephesus showed the same kind of zeal for the phrase "one incarnate nature," and maintained that any theology which was not based on the idea behind it was heretical. Led by this conviction, that Council acquitted Eutyches, in spite of the fact that he had shown reluctance to accept the phrase "of the same substance with us."

---

[1] The statement of Eutyches was, ὁμολογῶ ἐκ δύο φύσεων γεγνῆσθαι τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν πρὸ τῆς ἑνώσεως, μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἑνώσιν, μία φύσις ὁμολογῶ.

(Mansi VI 744). Taken by itself, this statement does not make sense, except if we ascribe to Eutyches an Origenist Christology. That this is not what he meant is clear both from his rejection of the notion that the body of our Lord had come from heaven, and from the way he defended himself on the strength of Patristic tradition. So he maintained that Athanasius, Cyril and the fathers ἐκ δύο φύσεων εἶπον πρὸ τῆς ἑνώσεως, μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἑνώσιν, καὶ τὴν σάρκωσιν οὐκέτι δύο φύσεις εἶπον, ἀλλὰ μίαν.

(Mansi VI 745).

[2] T. H. Bindley: *op. cit.* p. 234.

In this context we may look into the confession of the Faith which Eutyches presented to the second Ephesian Council. It is reasonable to think that this was the statement he had submitted to the Home Synod of Constantinople but had not been read. According to the confession, Eutyches anathematised all heretics, Manes, Valentinus, Apollinarius, Nestorius, and all others back to Simon Magus.

---

[1] Granting, in fairness to Leo and to the Council of Chalcedon, that the statement of Eutyches is, on the face of it, misleading, the fact seems to be that their purpose was to discredit Eutyches because he did not accept "two natures after the union." If it were otherwise, both Leo and the Council would have quoted Eutyches in his own precise words. For he had never said "but after the union, I admit but One Nature," as Leo tries to make out; nor did he "fashion anew One Nature after the Union," as the Council endeavoured to establish. Therefore, in their verdict on the Eutychian question, the Home Synod of Constantinople as well as the Council of Chalcedon were trying to discredit the Alexandrine theological reflection.

Then he went on to register his dissent from those who maintained that the body of our Lord had come down from heaven.[1] "For He Himself," Eutyches affirmed, "who is the Word of God descended from heaven, without flesh, was made flesh of the very flesh of the Virgin unchangeably and inconvertibly in a way that He Himself knew and willed. And He who is always perfect God before the ages, the Same also was made perfect man for us and for our salvation."[2]

Granting that this confession is not adequate or comprehensive from the point of view of the later norm of orthodoxy held by both Chalcedonians and non-Chalcedonians, the fact that it excluded the notions ascribed to Eutyches by the Home Synod of Constantinople, Leo of Rome and the Council of Chalcedon is obvious. In an age when the conflict between the Alexandrines and the Antiochenes was so intense and bitter that either side could see only heresy in the other, Eutyches happened to be a strong supporter of the former against the latter. However, even in that age men could, if they wanted, take the Formulary of Reunion of 433 as a basis for trying to work out a synthesis. For, as we shall see later, that document had employed the phrase "two natures" in a guarded way and without giving occasion to heresy. The negotiations between the two parties which had gone before its acceptance had shown to the Antiochenes that the "one nature" of the Alexandrines was not heretical. The Byzantine Home Synod went beyond the terms of agreement of 433, and asserted the full-fledged Antiochene phrase to the exclusion of the Alexandrine. The second Ephesian Council, though it did not openly challenge the Formulary, failed to show clearly on the basis of theological principles how the Antiochene phrase was misleading. On the contrary, it assumed that the phrase "one incarnate nature" was exclusively orthodox.

---

[1] Mansi VI 633. At Chalcedon, the confession of Eutyches was read only up to here, as the reading was interupted by Eusebius of Dorylaeum. (See below p. 79.) It would seem that Eusebius deliberately intervened at this stage of the reading.

[2] Hahn: Bibliothek. . ., p.

In the light of these facts, if we may use the Hegelian language, the Home Synod can be taken as thesis, and the second Council of Ephesus as its antithesis. We would expect the Council of Chalcedon to offer a synthesis. Whether it actually provided that or not, has to be discussed later. The point to be made in the present context is that, on the strength of our evidence, we have no valid ground to regard even Eutyches as a heretic in the historical situation in which he lived. Therefore, the ascription of heresy to Dioscorus simply because he defended the old monk in agreement with the Council of 449 has absolutely no justification.

III. There is a third consideration against the view that Dioscorus was a "Eutychian." The section of the

Church that opposed the Council of Chalcedon had, from the very beginning of their protest, made it clear that they were not supporters either of the person of, or of the views ascribed to, Eutyches.[1] So far as we have evidence, the leaders of the non-Chalcedonian party began to condemn Eutyches by name only after 476.

The earliest non-Chalcedonian leaders were Theodosius of Jerusalem[2] and Timothy Aelurus of Alexandria.[3] Both these men opposed the "Eutychian" teaching, both by writing treatises against it and imposing ecclesiastical discipline on its votaries. Even to this day, the Syrian Church, both in the Middle East and in India, includes Eutyches in the list of heretics to be repudiated by candidates to the ministry.[4] Dioscorus, on the other hand, has all through the centuries been remembered by the non-Chalcedonian section of the Church in its diptychs.[1]

---

[1] As for Eutyches, there is no evidence that he was even present at Chalcedon. We do not know what happened to him after the Council of Ephesus in 449. Severus of Antioch, however, says that he "returned to his vomit" (See below pp. 295f.), meaning thereby that he resumed the teaching ascribed to him. In view of the fact that Severus wrote in the sixth century, when for both parties Eutyches himself was a heretic, his statement might be based on a confusion. For from the middle of the fifth century there was in the East a theological position, which, judging from its portrayal by opponents, comprehended only the notions ascribed to Eutyches, and its exponents came to be characterised as "Eutychianists." The connection between them and Eutyches is doubtful. Since they were called "Eutychianists," Severus might have regarded Eutyches as its originator.

[2] See below pp. 198f.

[3] See below pp. 201f.

[4] This can be found in the Ordination Service of the Syrian Church.

Therefore, from the time of the split between the Chalcedonian and the non-Chalcedonian sections of the Church the latter has been distinguishing Dioscorus from Eutyches. Scholars known to the West seem to proceed on the assumption that all those who opposed the Council belonged to one group consisting of men holding different shades of heretical notions. Needless to say, this is the Chalcedonian version of history, which is both inaccurate and one-sided. The fact is that, from the time of the Council of Chalcedon, the one Church came to be divided into two enduring groups. In the judgment of the anti-Chalcedonian group, what is known to history as "Eutychianism" is a heresy. But in regard to Dioscorus, it recognises him as an orthodox prelate of the Church, who opposed an innovation in the Faith introduced by Chalcedon. Whether or not this claim is defensible, needs a fuller examination of facts. In the present context we can very well say that even the documents preserved by Chalcedonians[2] do not provide a shadow of evidence that he was a heretic.

---

[1] See the fifth section of the diptychs in the Syrian Eucharistic Service.

[2] The Acts of the Council of Chalcedon to which we refer from Mansi's collection were originally recorded by Chalcedonians and preserved by them.

Chapter Two

Dioscorus and the Council of Chalcedon

We have seen in the foregoing chapter that the sentence of deposition against Dioscorus was not on the strength of evidence that he was a heretic. Why, then, was he deposed? In the absence of evidence that he was heterodox, the only means to answer this question is to examine the way he was actually deposed. This point does not seem to have received any attention from scholars who proceed on the assumption that Dioscorus was a "violent man," that he endeavoured to dominate the Church, and that he introduced disorder in the Church. We shall, therefore, try in this chapter to bring out the way Dioscorus was deposed, limiting our enquiry to Mansi's collection of original documents connected with the Council of Chalcedon.[1]

The Council of Chalcedon had its first session on October 8, 451.[2] No sooner had the assembled bishops been seated than Paschasinus, the leader of the Roman delegation to the Council, made a brief statement. We have orders, he stated, from the Most Blessed and Apostolic Bishop of Rome, (the) Head of all Churches, to the effect that Dioscorus should not be seated in the Assembly, and that if this were allowed, he (Leo) is being cast out.[1] For us this view of the matter is essential. We, therefore, await your excellency's injunction; either he goes out, or we depart.[2]

---

[1] All the facts to be mentioned in this chapter are taken from Mansi VI which contains the minutes of the first and second sessions of the Council of Chalcedon, and also those of the special meeting of a section of the bishops who deposed Dioscorus.

[2] For the minutes of the first session of the Council see Mansi VI 564-937.

The Commissioners: What is the complaint against His Grace bishop Dioscorus?

Paschasinus: Since he is present, it is obligatory that he be opposed (ἀναγκαῖον ἔστιν ἐκείνῳ ἀντιτεθῆναι).

The Commissioners: In the light of what is already stated, let the charge be made plain regarding which he is to be examined.

Lucentius; another member of the Roman delegation: He ought to give an explanation of his own decision. For without being entitled to it, he seized and dominated the office of the judge, and dared to conduct a Council without authorisation from the

---

[1] εἰ δὲ ἐπιχειρήσει τοῦτο ποιῆσαι, ἐκβληθείη
This obviously refers to Leo. The point is that if Dioscorus participates in the Council, Leo may be regarded as having nothing to do with it.

[2] Mansi VI 580-581.

Apostolic See, a thing which has never happened and which ought not to happen.[1]

Paschasinus: It is not possible for us to violate the orders of the Most Blessed and Apostolic Bishop who occupies the Apostolic See, neither to stand against the ecclesiastical laws nor the tradition of the Fathers.

---

[1] This is the only charge the Roman legates made against Dioscorus till they made their declaration in connection with his deposition. The implications of this statement are many. (a) The bishop of Rome is the Head of the universal Church This is an assertion which had never been made in any Council before, nor which had received any acceptance in the Church in the East even to the present day. (b) Without his authorisation no Council could be convened. It must be remembered that Leo had sent legates to the second Council of Ephesus, the authority of which is now being challenged. This fact contradicts the Roman claim. For Leo had been forced to send a delegation to a Council, which met without his authorisation. If his authorisation was indispensable for the convening of a Council, why did he send an official representation to it? Though Lucentius asserts that no Council had ever met before without authorization from Rome, the fact is that neither the Council of Nicea in 325 nor that of Constantinople in 381 had any authorisation from Rome for their convening. In spite of this, Rome itself had already recognised them as ecumenical. In the second Council of Constantinople recognised as ecumenical by Rome and the entire Chalcedonian body, the Roman bishop of the time was reduced to an extremely pitiable state, a travesty on such claims as those of Leo. (c) The charge is that Dioscorus "Seized and dominated the office of the judge." This is opposed to facts. If it refers to the fact that he was one of the presidents of the second Ephesian Council, it was the result of an imperial designation (Mansi VI 600). If, on the other hand, it refers to the decision of the Council, at which Dioscorus was the most important man, those decisions, as we shall see from now on, were throughout conciliar. The fact to be remembered is that till the Council arrived at its decisions, Dioscorus' right to preside was not called in question by any one, including Leo.

The Commissioners: It is good for us to know what fault he has committed.

Lucentius: Neither we nor you tolerate the kind of disgrace which has been brought about by the action taken at Ephesus [in 449.]

The Commissioners: If you have the role of judge, you ought not to become involved in the argument.
(εἰ δικαστοῦ ἐπέχεις πρόσωπον, ὡς δικαζόμενος οὐκ ὀφείλεις δικαιολογεῖσθαι)[1]

With this comment the Commissioners ordered Dioscorus to move from his seat in the assembly to the place reserved for the accused.

In this way an initial victory of lasting effect was scored by the Roman legates. As is clear from the conversation between them and the Commissioners, the latter paid no attention to the charge made by the former. Why, then, did Leo take so hostile and unjust a stand against Dioscorus? Had the bishop of Alexandria done anything against the person of Leo, except what had happened at Ephesus in 449?

It is in answer to the last question that the alleged excommunication of Leo by Dioscorus needs to be examined.

---

[1] This may be taken as a statement of general principle made by the Commissioners referring to themselves, namely that the Roman legates demanded the exclusion of Dioscorus from the assembly, and that, as judges, they need not undertake to argue against the move. If this reading is correct, it is a clear indication that the Commissioners could not see justice in the demand.

This has been taken by all historians and scholars in the field to whom the present writer has had a chance of referring as an established fact. But this uncritical assumption has many problems, which we may state here.

(a) Neither Leo nor his representatives showed any knowledge of it till October 13, 451. If they had any knowledge of an excommunication of Leo by Dioscorus, the Roman legates would have referred to it from the beginning of the Council. We shall see later[1] that, in the course of the Council's first session on October 8 there was a time when Paschasinus, the chief of the Roman delegation, literally indulged in mocking at Dioscorus, referring to the treatment Flavian had received at Ephesus. If they had any knowledge of an excommunication of Leo, they would not have refrained from referring to it also in that context. Even in reply to the Commissioners' challenge of the justice of their demand for excluding Dioscorus from the Council, they did not make mention of an excommunication of Leo pronounced by him. This is not because they did not want to mention an incident which was an insult to their master. For on October 13, in their declaration against Dioscorus, they mentioned it.[2] The first session of the Council witnessed a protracted unsuccessful attempt on the part of Dioscorus' opponents to make out some charge against him personally. But not one of the Eastern neighbours of the bishop of Alexandria mentioned this point. Excommunication of Leo by Dioscorus, if it were a fact, could not have happened in secret. There was mention of an event like this on October 13, but no one except the Roman legates made mention of it in the course of the Council's investigations before October 22. (b)This charge was made for the first time by a certain deacon Theodore of Alexandria. As we shall see more clearly later, on October 13 the special gathering of a section of the bishops undertook to examine the case of Dioscorus and served him with three summonses demanding his presence to answer charges against him. By the time the envoys of the second summons came back to the assembly with their report, there were four men from Alexandria ready with petitions against their archbishop. One of the four was Theodore. His petition addressed to Leo and the ecumenical Council[1] stated that Dioscorus had, with the concurrence of about ten bishops, excommunicated Leo.[2]

---

[1] See below p. 100.

[2] See below p. 140.

---

[1] Mansi VI 1,005.

[2] Mansi VI 1,009. The statement is this.
ἀκοινωνησίαν κατὰ τοῦ ἁγιοτάτου, καὶ ὁσιοτάτου Ἀποστολικοῦ Θρόνου τῆς

If we recall the charges against Athanasius at the Council of Tyre in 335, we shall realise that accusations of this kind are not to be credited with truth, unless they are substantiated by other unquestionable evidences. In the case of Dioscorus, the leaders of the Council of Chalcedon had no idea of being fair to him, and when deacon Theodore made the allegation, it was taken by the Roman legates on the strength of his word. (c) Even if this were fact, the Roman legates' attitude towards Dioscorus at the beginning of the Council is not likely to have much to do with it. For it is alleged that the bishop of Alexandria excommunicated Leo on his way to Chalcedon,[1] whereas the Roman legates

---

μεγάλης ῥώμης παρασκευάζει τοὺς ἅμα αὐτῷ ἐξελθόντας ἐξ Αἰγύπτους ἐπισκόπους τὸν ἀριθμὸν πλέον ἢ ἔλαττον δέκα, οὐδὲ γὰρ πλείους τετολμήκασιν ἐξελθεῖν ἅμα αὐτῷ, διὰ τὰ παρ᾽ αὐτοῦ κατὰ τὴν Ἐφεσίων παρανομηθέντα, καθυπογράψαι ταύτῃ, τῇ μὲν ἀπειλῶν, τῇ δὲ ἀπάντων οὐ βουλομένος· ἀμέλει δακρίοντες, καὶ στένοντες ὑπέγραψαν τῷ ἀθεμίτῳ ἐκείνῳ χάρτῃ.

[1] See above p. 8, note 1. R. V. Sellers, The Council of Chalcedon, p. 103. Sellers takes the excommunication of Leo as a fact. His references are two (p. 103, note 1). (a) Deacon Theodore's petition to which we have referred, and (b) the official report of the Council of Chalcedon to Leo. The strange thing is that the latter speaks only that Dioscorus had "planned to excommunicate Leo." For Sellers, however, it had happened.

state that they have orders (προστάξεις) from Leo. These must have been issued long before the alleged excommunication. Therefore, the only ground of Rome's hostility to Dioscorus was that he happened to be the ablest man among the Alexandrines who showed reluctance at Ephesus in 449 to submit to Leo's theological dictation.[1]

As we have noted, the Roman legates succeeded in their demand. Now when the whole assembly was seated and Dioscorus being posted in the middle as a man on trial,[2] Eusebius of Dorylaeum came forward with a petition, indicting the bishop of Alexandria of two ecclesiastical crimes. On the one hand, he asserted, Dioscorus had infringed upon the Faith of the Church by trying to establish the heresy of Eutyches as orthodoxy; and, on the other, he had unjustly deposed the petitioner who had never trespassed against the Faith.[3] This charge, he stated, will be substantiated from the minutes of the second Ephesian Council.

---

[1] It is not meant here that the Council of 449 was justified in not reading Leo's *Tome*. The Council should certainly have read it and registered dissent from its theology, if the bishops were so minded to do. That, however, would not have solved the problem.

[2] There is no evidence that Eutyches was even present at Chalcedon. The fact, therefore, is that, on the strength of the questionable assumption which we have seen in the preceding chapter, the Council assumed that Eutyches was a heretic. The man whom the Council of Chalcedon endeavoured to dispose of was Dioscorus, though the Council has popularly been credited with having examined the Eutychian question.

[3] Mansi VI 585.

From the petition of Eusebius two points become clear. (a) The bishop of Dorylaeum is taking for granted that a charge of heresy has been proved against Eutyches. However, the fact is, as we have seen in the last chapter, neither the Home Synod of Constantinople nor the Council of Chalcedon had any valid ground for regarding Eutyches as a heretic. (b) On the strength of this unverified assumption, Eusebius is proceeding to accuse Dioscorus of having violated the Faith of the Church, because the second Council of Ephesus had acquitted the old monk. The charge against Dioscorus is a charge against a Council. The charge against the Council has never been proved. Therefore, the entire procedure of the Council from the beginning was absolutely unjust.

Faced with attacks on his person, Dioscorus argued that the Council of 449 had been convened by the emperor, that the Acts of the Home Synod of Constantinople held under the presidency of bishop Flavian were recorded in the minutes of that Council (namely of Ephesus in 449), and that the minutes may be read.[1] "That is what we also demand," interrupted Eusebius. Continuing his statement, Dioscorus requested that before the minutes were read, the Council should take up the subject of the Faith.

---

[1] Mansi VI 585. According to Hefele, "Required to reply to this by the imperial commissioners and senators, Dioscorus first demanded that they should read the Acts of the Council at Constantinople under Flavian. When his opponents also presented this petition, he changed his plan and wished first to introduce a doctrinal discussion

This request of the bishop of Alexandria was very significant. From his point of view, the controversy was the result of an Antiochene violation of the terms of agreement reached in 433 between Cyril of Alexandria and John of Antioch.[1] The Home Synod of Constantinople had, in his judgment, supported that violation; and it was the defenders of that movement that were trying to dominate the Church by calling in question the decision of the Council of 449 which, in his view, had only endeavoured to remain

---

on the question, what was the true Christological faith" (op. cit., p. 300)., The statement of Dioscorus, according to Mansi was this: ἐκέλευσεν ὁ εὐλαβέστατος βασιλεὺς συνόδον συγκροτηθῆναι· καὶ δὲ συγκροτεῖται κατὰ θεῖον νεῦμα τοῦ εὐσεβεστάτου βασιλέως ἡμῶν. περὶ δὲ τῶν πεπραγμένων διὰ τὸν γενόμενον ἐπίσκοπον τοῦ κωνσταντινοπόλεως ἁγίας ἐκκλησίας φλαυιανόν, ὑπομνηματά εἰσι πεπραγμένα ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ συνόδῳ, καὶ παρακαλῶ ἀναγνωθῆναι.

Kidd gives the impression that Eusebius alone demanded the reading of the minutes (op. cit., p. 316). But the reference he gives (n. 1, Mansi VI 585 c) contains first the request of Dioscorus which we have quoted above. It was followed by the interruption of Eusebius. In fact, in the reference given by Kidd there is no request of Eusebius for the reading of the minutes except this interruption. Kidd also ignores the request of Dioscorus to take up the subject of the Faith. In his recent work, Sellers also does not show a knowledge of these facts. (op. cit., p. 104).

[1] See the letter of Dioscorus to Domnus of Antioch, below pp. 167f.

loyal to the already established tradition of the Church. In that situation, the only course of action open to Dioscorus was to demand a discussion of the Faith. If this were granted, Dioscorus could expect to defend against attacks from adversaries both his theological position and the decision of the Council of Ephesus.

In answer to his request, Dioscorus was told by the Commissioners that, since there were personal charges against him, they had to be examined. Thus the reading of the Ephesian Council's minutes began, starting with the imperial mandates issued for convening the Council. These were seven in number, three addressed to Dioscorus, one to the assembly, one to Barsumas, an abbot whose presence at the Council was permitted by the emperor, one to Proclus the governor of Asia, and one to Elpidius and Eulogius whom Theodosius appointed to represent him at the assembly.[1] A quick glance at these mandates will show (a) that Theodosius regarded the treatment rendered by the Home Synod of Constantinople to Eutyches as incongruous with the traditional Faith of the Church; (b) that he required of the bishops to confirm the doctrinal definitions of the earlier Councils, and, in their light, to take up the question of Eutyches: (c) that he entrusted the presidency of the Council to Dioscorus, and required of Juvenal of Jerusalem and Thalassius of Caesarea in Cappadocia to cooperate with the bishop of Alexandria in exercising authority over the Council; (d) that he was opposed to Theodoret of Cyrus being present at the Council; and (e) that he did not want any one to exercise freedom of speech at the assembly, except those who had not added anything to, or subtracted from, what had already been decided at Nicea and Ephesus concerning the Faith.[1]

---

[1] For these mandates, see Mansi VI 588-600.

When the reading of the first mandate requiring the exclusion of Theodoret from the Ephesian Council was over, the secretary who read the document stated that there had been similar mandates against other bishops also. The Commissioners now availed themselves of that opportunity to celebrate Pulcheria's contempt of her deceased brother by introducing Theodoret into the Council, on the ground that Leo had restored him to the episcopate (ἀποκατέστησεν αὐτῷ τὴν ἐπισκοπήν), and that the emperor had permitted him to attend the Council. When he came in, there broke out in the assembly a wild storm of uproar. "Goodness gracious,"[2] shouted the bishops of the Alexandrine party, "the Faith is destroyed. The canons cast out this

---

[1] Mansi VI 589.

[2] The Greek is ἐλεήσατε, which is taken here as an interjection.

(man). Cast him out. Cast out the teacher of Nestorius." The Antiochene party retorted. "We signed blank papers. We were beaten and we subscribed. Cast out the enemies of Flavian. Cast out the enemies of the Faith!"

Dioscorus: How is not Cyril cast out? He (Theodoret) has anathematised him (Cyril).

The Antiochenes: Cast out Dioscorus, the murderer. Who does not know the works (πράξεις) of Dioscorus?

The Alexandrines: Many years to the empress.

The Antiochenes: Cast out the murderers.

The Alexandrines: The empress has cast out Nestorius. Many years to her who is orthodox. The Synod does not receive Theodoret.

Now Theodoret stepped forward and said that he had submitted a petition[1] to the emperor, and was awaiting a ruling. The Commissioners, who had earlier stated regarding Theodoret that, since Leo and the emperor were in his favour, he ought to be present at the Council, now told the assembly that he was present in the capacity of an accuser.[2] The fact, however, is that, if the bishop of Cyrus had a petition, it was not read at Chalcedon. This means that his presence at the Council in the capacity of an accuser was never verified, and that the Commissioners' statement was not substantiated. When the Commissioners finished their statement in defence of Theodoret, the Antiochenes cried out: "(He is) worthy; (he is) worthy."

---

[1] It has not been possible to look into the contents of this petition in this study. As it was not read at Chalcedon, its omission does not have any consequence here.

[2] Mansi VI 592. According to Hefele, Theodoret stated that he had a petition against Dioscorus and that it should be read (*History of the Councils*, Eng. tr., III, p. 300).

The Alexandrines: Say not that he is bishop; he is no bishop. Cast out the fighter against God. Cast out the Jew.

The Antiochenes: The orthodox to the Synod. Cast out the turbulent. Cast out the murderers.

The Alexandrines: Cast out the fighter against God. Cast him out who defies Christ. Many years to the empress. Many years to the emperor. To the orthodox emperor, many years. This (man) has anathematised Cyril.

The Antiochenes: Cast out Dioscorus, the murderer.

The Alexandrines: Many years to the senate.

Basil of Trajanopolis stood up and said: Theodoret has been condemned by us.

The Alexandrines: Theodoret has condemned Cyril. If we receive Cyril, Theodoret should be cast out. The canons cast out this (man). God has forsaken this (man).

The Commissioners were not going to be swayed by the shouts of bishops of the Alexandrine party, and they rebuked them, saying that it was unbecoming of bishops to indulge in vulgar shouts of this kind. The Alexandrines answered: "Cast out one (man), and we shall all listen. It is out of conviction that we cry out, and it is for the sake of the orthodox Faith that we speak these (things)."

This, however, had no effect. Theodoret remained in the assembly, and these bishops who shouted against him so vehemently recognised him as orthodox at a later stage, without even asking him to renounce his anti-Cyrilline works. The quality of justice that prevailed at Chalcedon may be noted by comparing the treatment accorded to Theodoret and that rendered to Dioscorus. Till the end, as we shall see, not a single charge against the latter had a shadow of evidence, but the commissioners had nothing to say on that point.

As soon as the reading of the imperial mandates was over, Dioscorus pointed out that, whereas he alone was set apart for trial, the fact was that the emperor had given authority over the Council of 449 to himself, Juvenal and Thalassius, that, in regard to the decisions reached, they as well as the entire assembly had been in agreement which they signified both by acclamation and subscription, and that the emperor Theodosius had ratified everything that had been done.[1]

So the question of how Dioscorus alone could be specially treated came up as a vital issue. The Antiochene party gave expression to their view of the matter. Nobody has agreed to the decision, they shouted, but they were forced to sign a blank paper. Threatened with blows (βίᾳ μετὰ πληγῶν) and with excommunication and exile, they signed out of compulsion. What kind of a Synod was that? Dioscorus did all this by calling in aid the cooperation of soldiers. Cast out the murderers (φόνεα). Flavian was removed by soldiers. Now the Alexandrines rejoined: They were the ones who signed first. Now why do clergy carry on shouting? The Synod is of bishops, not of clergy. Cast out those who are not of the Synod[2] (τοὺς περισσούς). Let those with whom we put our signature step forward.

---

[1] Mansi VI 601.

[2] This is an indication that the bishops had brought with them large numbers of the minor clergy simply for the purpose of shouting in the assembly and that they did the work assigned to them from the Council hall itself. We shall see later (see below pp. 116f.) that this "ordained" mob shouted for the deposition and exile of Dioscorus at the end of the second session. Such things might have happened at Ephesus too. But not one of the bishops testified even at Chalcedon that he had raised objection to it in 449. However, at Chalcedon the bishops of the Alexandrine party demanded that the mobs of clergy should clear out.

Stephen of Ephesus made a statement. It must be remembered that the point at issue was how Dioscorus could be held solely responsible for what had happened at Ephesus in 449. The statement of Stephen was to this effect. He had received into communion presbyter Elpidius and the other deacons (these men belonged to the clergy of Flavian), and also bishop Eusebius. Now Elpidius and Eulogius, the imperial commissioners at Ephesus, came to the bishop's house accompanied by soldiers[1] and monks of Eutyches, numbering about three hundred men, and said to Stephen that he was showing himself to be an enemy of the emperor. All this, he testified, was done by force. Since this statement contained nothing against Dioscorus, the commissioners asked what the connection between this incident and the bishop of Alexandria was. All these men, answered Stephen, were adherents of Dioscorus. They did not let me go out until I subscribed to the decree of Dioscorus, Juvenal, Thalassius and the rest of the bishops.

We may pause for a moment and ask ourselves what this story, assuming it to be true, actually proved. It showed only that the imperial policy in 449 was opposed to Flavian and Eusebius, that the state insisted on Stephen that he should give up all contacts with those men, and that the bishop of Ephesus attributed all these occurrences to Dioscorus.

---

[1] Mansi VI 604.

As his name was mentioned by Stephen, Thalassius thought it necessary to keep himself out of trouble. He said that he did not know how he was assigned responsibility. Things happened the way it had been done. He tried to stop it; but did not succeed.[1] In this context, Theodore of Claudiopolis came forward with a report which aroused lengthy debate. According to him, everything at Ephesus had been the work of Dioscorus, Juvenal and the early signatories.[2] He and the men with him as well as Flavian were not allowed to speak. The shouts that they were in league with the heresy of Nestorius, that those who affirmed "two natures" deserved to be rent assunder, that they should be cast out, and so on, frightened them. Being afraid that they would be sent out, and being mindful of those whom they had baptised and remain faithful, they kept quiet. The Synod had been convened by the emperor primarily to decide the case of Flavian; but they (the men on the side of Dioscorus) conducted several meetings and informed no one of their decisions, which were neither subscribed nor even written down. On the other hand,

---

[1] Though Thalassius is now trying to show himself innocent, he was held responsible by the commissioners for the Council of 449.

[2] The statement of Theodore is found in Mansi VI 604-605. It is noteworthy that this bishop does not mention the name of Thalassius, though Stephen of Ephesus before him had included him also.

Dioscorus and Juvenal extended to them blank papers (προσήνεγκαν ἡμῖν ἀγράφους χάρτας Διόσκορος καὶ Ἰουβενάλιος). having with them (Dioscorus and Juvenal) a crowd of unrecognizable men shouting greatly, threatening and shaking the Synod.[1] The bishops were a hundred and thirty-five in all, of whom forty-two were not allowed even to speak. The rest were controlled by Dioscorus, Juvenal and the disorderly mob. The men with Theodore were fifteen. What could they do? They were regarded as heretics.

"This is what every body says," shouted the Antiochenes, "and this is the truth." The bishops of the Alexandrine party retorted: Those who fear in this way are not Christians. They are certainly not orthodox. For if men are given to fear, there would be no martyrs. When the shouting subsided, Dioscorus made a statement.

> They say that they had not agreed to the things decided and defined, but had simply signed blank papers distributed to them. Most certainly it was not necessary for them to sign had they not been in agreement, for it was a matter concerning Faith. Since, however, they complain that blank paper was distributed for signature, I would request your excellency to order them to state what their words imply.

No attention was paid to this request. On the contrary, the commissioners ordered the reading of the minutes to continue.

---

[1] Mansi VI 605.

As we have seen, the investigation started with the question, how Dioscorus alone could be set apart for special trial. That was not answered. Even the allegation regarding the blank paper and the city rabble was spoken, not against Dioscorus alone, but against Dioscorus and Juvenal.

The reading of the minutes proper now started beginning with the names of participants at the Ephesian Council of 449. The names read in the order of Dioscorus, Julius the representative of Leo, Juvenal of Jerusalem, Domnus of Antioch, Flavian of Constantinople and so on down the list.[1] As soon as the five names were read, there arose a storm of shouts from the Antiochene side.[2] "Flavian went in as one condemned, and that was by being falsely accused. Why was not Flavian assigned his own place? Why was the bishop of Constantinople seated as the fifth?" Paschasinus, the chief of the Roman delegation availed himself of this opportunity to play on the emotions of these Easterns and said: "See, God willing, we regard Lord Anatolius as the first (man). They ranked the blessed Flavian as the fifth (man)."[3] Paschasinus achieved his desired goal, and Diogenes of Cyzicus commented: "It is because you know canons." At this time the bishops of the Alexandrine party again made the request that those who were not members of the Council should be asked to go out. Apparently there was uncontrollable shouting in the assembly hall. Now Theodore of Clandiopolis, the man who had the most damaging report about the Council of Ephesus, rejoined that the noise was produced by the notaries of Dioscorus. The bishop of Alexandria answered that he had only two notaries. How can, he asked, the two produce the noise of a crowd? Again the commissioners paid no attention to the request of the bishops of the Alexandrine party, but required the reading of the minutes to continue.

---

[1] For this list, see Mansi VI 605-612.

[2] *Ibid.*, 608.

[3] The shrewdness displayed by Paschasinus is worthy of special notice. However, not one of the bishops present had the courage or even the clearness of thinking to point out that the place Anatolius obtained was by recognising

At the very beginning of the Ephesian Council the men representing Leo had demanded that the letter of their master should be read. According to the minutes, when the request was made, Dioscorus ruled: "Let the letter of our pious brother and fellow bishop Leo be shown forth (ὑποδειχθήτω) to this holy and ecumenical Council."[1] When it was produced, presbyter John, the chief notary, stated: "There is another document given by our holy and God-fearing archbishop Dioscorus. It

---

Leo as the "Head of the Universal Church," for which there had been no precedent in history except the assertions of Innocent I and Leo I.

[1] Mansi VI 616.

is in our hands to be delivered to your Holiness." Now the ruling came from Juvenal of Jerusalem: "Let it be read and recorded in the minutes."

In this context Aetius, archdeacon of Constantinople and chief notary at the Council of Chalcedon, raised the question why the Tome had not been read at Ephesus. "It was neither shown nor read," asserted Aetius. "It was not read to us," shouted the Antiochene bishops. "The synodical letter was not read," said Eusebius of Dorylaeum. "It was withheld." "It is certain," stated Theodore of Claudiopolis. "We all know that it was not read. We all confess that." The Commissioners ruled that the bishops who had wielded authority over the Council should say why the Tome had not been read. Now Dioscorus stated: "What is done is clear enough. I suggested (διαλάλησα) twice that the writing of the pious bishop of Rome be read." The commissioners asked him, why then had it not been read. This time Dioscorus required that the question be directed to the bishops who had charge over the matter. When questioned who they were, he gave the names of Juvenal and Thalassius.[1] The Commissioners again pressed for an answer from Dioscorus and he replied: "I have already stated that I suggested it to be read twice." "He is lying," commented Eusebius of Dorylaeum. Turning to Juvenal, the commissioners asked, why, in spite of Dioscorus' suggestion, the Tome had not been read. This obviously was an occasion to prove the comment of Eusebius; for in that atmosphere, if Dioscorus was actually lying, Juvenal would have called in question the statement of the bishop of Alexandria that he had twice suggested that the Tome be read. In fact, Juvenal had nothing of the kind to testify. On the contrary, he answered that, as soon as presbyter John finished reading the imperial mandates, the holy Scripture had to be read. The commissioners asked why the Tome had not been taken up after the reading of the Scriptures. Subsequently, he replied, nobody, whether the notaries or any one else, mentioned it. The question was now directed to Thalassius, who answered: "I know one thing, namely that I did not prevent it; nor did I have enough authority by myself to order its reading."[1]

---

[1] Mansi VI 617.

The fact is that every one at the Council knew of Leo's Tome and that it was not read. When the Roman legates required its reading, none of the three presidents really wanted it to be done, because its theology was at variance with theirs. The assembled bishops too were not concerned to know what Leo had to say on the doctrinal issue. Therefore, its omission was a conciliar action. To regard Dioscorus as solely responsible for it was plainly unjust.

---

[1] This is the story of which Kidd writes that when the minutes of the Ephesian Council were read, "the audience heard how Dioscorus had burked the recitation of the Tome of St. Leo" (op. cit., p. 316). Hefele's version of the incident may be found (op. cit., pp. 303-304).

The next topic in the minutes was the acquittal of Eutyches and the deposition of Flavian and Eusebius. This was the way the Council of Ephesus had taken up that subject. Dioscorus asked presbyter John, the notary, to read the imperial letter indicating the purpose for which the Council had been convened.[1] When the reading was over, Thalassius stated that the Council met to ratify the Faith, so that every effort to violate it may be rendered fruitless. Dioscorus presented the case more persuasively. The content of the imperial mandate is clear, he affirmed. Some innovation has been introduced at Constantinople. It has to be examined. The laws of the Church are plain. What the earlier Councils have defined is also clear. The devoted and Christ-loving emperor has convened the present Council, not to formulate the Faith, for it has been already defined, but to examine what has arisen and see whether it is in harmony with the teaching of the fathers. Or is it desirable that we nullify the doctrine of the fathers? "If any one nullifies," responded the Council, "let him be anathema." We shall preserve the Faith of the fathers.[1]

---

[1] Mansi VI 621.

---

[1] Mansi VI 624. At this state of the reading there was a great uproar at Chalcedon. "We did not say these (things)," shouted the Antiochenes. "Who said these things?" The attempt was to make out that Dioscorus wrote these exclamations in the blank papers in which he had collected signatures from bishops. So Theodore of Claudiopolis, our old friend, started the debate. These things, he said, are to be found in what his (Dioscorus') notaries have taken down. Let all the notaries who wrote come forward and testify who wrote these things, so that we may know whether what has been read is accurate, or whether any change has been made later.

The Commissioners: Who wrote these (things)?

Dioscorus: Every one wrote by the help of his notary. My notary, for instance, wrote for me, Juvenal's for him, and Thalassius' for him. Other bishops had other notaries, so that what is written is not a copy of what my notaries took down.

Juvenal: My notary took down with others.

Dioscorus: Take the report of Juvenal's notary, or of Thalassius, or of the bishop of Corinth.

In the face of this answer, nothing could be proved against Dioscorus, and Eusebius of Dorylaeum was determined to establish some flaw. That, he thought, could be done by reverting back to the charge of the blank papers. So he demanded of Stephen of Ephesus an explanation. Let bishop Stephen, required Eusebius, say whether his notaries had not taken down the minutes, and what they suffered at the hands of the notaries of Dioscorus.

The Commissioners: What does bishop Stephen say concerning these things?

Stephen: My notaries, Julian now bishop of Lebed and Crispinus his deacon, were taking down the minutes. The notaries of Dioscorus came and took away from

Dioscorus: For the sake of peace for all, of the confirmation of the Faith, and the removal of what has arisen, I have read the Faith of the fathers

---

> them the writing tablets. Desiring to make my notaries copy what they had taken down, they tore off the formers' report. I do not know what happened, but that the same day, when the inspection took place, we had the papers inscribed. The bishops who had not taken down wrote down from my pledged copy. (Mansi VI 625).

Enthusiastically, Eusebius went on: Tell us bishop Stephen, how were the papers written.

Stephen: On blank papers. They were filled as soon as the deposition took place.

All these damaging reports were answered by Dioscorus. Let the account of Stephen be read, he demanded, in order to see if I forced him to copy anything. However, no answer came to this challenge either from the Commissioners or from the bishops. Instead Acacius of Ariarathea resumed the chorus: we were forced, compelled and subjected to myriads of ill-treatments in order to make us use blank papers. Unwilling as we were, by being shut up in the church till late at night, force was applied on us.

This is the story of the blank papers. From this one point becomes clear. In ancient days also people used to write only on blank papers. For them, as for us, the purpose of written papers was to read from, not to write on. We shall see at a later stage that these bishops who now accuse Dioscorus of terrorism beg pardon for having agreed to the condemnation of Flavian. If their signatures had been forcibly extracted, their prayer for forgiveness was superfluous. It must be remembered that the Council of 449 consisted of at least a hundred and thirty-five bishops and that not a single bishop has been reported to have stood out against such an alleged outrage on human dignity. Not only that, emperor Theodosius II had wholeheartedly supported that Council till his death in 450. Had these bishops any grievance that the Council had been conducted so indecently as all this, they would not have of Nicea and Ephesus.[1]

The Council: That saves the world. That Faith shall stand.

Dioscorus: Though two Councils are named, the Faith delivered is one.

The Council: The fathers defined everything in perfection. Let him who violates be anathema.

Dioscorus made this point once again. "The great guardian of the Faith, archbishop Dioscorus!" responded the Council. The bishop of Alexandria now stated that violation against the Faith is sin against the Lord. "We all agree," assented the Council. "Let those who oppose be anathema."

Dioscorus: Nobody is defining what has already been defined.

The Council: These are the words of the Holy Spirit. To the guardian of canons! Through you the fathers live! To the preserver of the Faith!"[2]

---

kept quiet over such a notorious violation of human rights. Whatever be the policy of the emperor, they would have notified to him the way things had been done at the Council which he was tenaciously defending. From what little information we have of these bishops we can definitely say that they were eminently capable of fabricating any fantastic story to discredit a man whom they wanted to keep down.

[1] Mansi VI 628.

[2] At Chalcedon, in an atmosphere different from that of Ephesus, the bishops opposed to Dioscorus tried to make out that this had never been spoken. "Nobody said these (things)," asserted Theodore of Clandiopolis. "You seem to be bent upon denying everything that has been affirmed," answered Dioscorus.

This was the introductory clarification of the theological position on the basis of which the Council of 449 took up the subject of Eutyches. What is central to it is the emphasis that any discussion of the Faith should take the decisions of the earlier Councils as inviolable.[1]

Having made clear the theological basis, the Council of Ephesus called in Eutyches. When he came in, Juvenal and Thalassius, as presiding officers at the Council, assured him that justice would be done in his case.[2] It was in this atmosphere that Eutyches presented his petition to the Council.

After an introduction, the petition quoted the Nicene Creed, regarding which the monk affirmed that he had been baptised and anointed in it, and that he had held fast to it ever since. The earlier Councils, he stated, had confirmed it and Cyril had it as the basis of his teaching.[3]

---

[1] From the point of view of the Council of 449, the phrase "two natures" was based on a separation between the human life of Christ and the eternal Son of God. So, the Council argued, its use is tantamount to denying the Nicene affirmation that the Son Himself came down and assumed flesh (see above pp. 74f). This, the critics of "two natures" believed, was the teaching of Nestorius, which had been condemned at the first Council of Ephesus. The point which Dioscorus tried to make and with which the Council assented was this emphasis.

[2] We may compare this action of Thalassius with his own words at Chalcedon denying to have held any authority at the Council of 449.

[3] Mansi VI 629.

When the petition of Eutyches was being read at Chalcedon from the minutes of the Ephesian Council, Eusebius interrupted the reader at this stage. "He was lying," said Eusebius, "This is not definition. What he affirmed is not canon."[1] Challenging Eusebius, Dioscorus made a statement.

> There are four documents for this definition. What the bishops have fixed, is it not definition? Is it that he does not consider that it is canon? Well, it is not canon. Canon is one thing; definition is another thing. Take five synodical documents, and I have (them). (Any)one has (them). All have accepted the documents.[2]

The argument of Dioscorus seems to be this. The definition of the Faith on which Eutyches based his Confession is to be found in four documents, namely the Creeds of Nicea and Constantinople, the second letter of Cyril to Nestorius, and the third letter of the former to the latter with the twelve anathematisms. There is a fifth document, and that is the Formulary of Reunion of 433. He accepts all the five, and there is no dispute about them.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 632.

[2] τεσσαρά ἐστιν βιβλία τὰ περιέχοντα τοῦτον τὸν ὅρον. ὃ ὥρισαν οἱ ἐπίσκοποι, οὐκ ἔστιν ὅρος; μὴ γὰρ, ἔχει, ὅτι κανὼν ἐστι; οὐκ ἔστι κανὼν. ἄλλο ἐστι κανὼν, ἄλλο ὅρος. κατηγόρησον πέντε συνοδικῶν βιβλίων. κἀγὼ ἔχω. καὶ ὁ δεῖνα (καὶ ὁ δεῖνα) ἔχει. ἐνέγκωσι πάντες τὰ βιβλία. The clause within brackets may well be a repetition.

Nobody answered the challenge of Dioscorus. On the contrary, Diogenes of Cyzicus made a statement to the effect that the Nicene Creed alone was not enough; for it could be accepted even by heretics, as Apollinarius had done. This provoked the Egyptian bishops and they exclaimed: "No one receives addition to, or subtraction from, what was decided at Nicea. The orthodox emperor has so ordered."[1] "These (things) were said by Eutyches," rejoined the Antiochenes. The Alexandrines repeated their shouts.

The reading of Eutyches' confession was now resumed. When it came to the place where he condemned all heretics and made it clear that the body of Christ had not been from heaven,[2] the bishops at Chalcedon again started a debate. As we have seen, Eusebius had assumed that the charge of heresy had been proved against Eutyches. In the face of the Confession now read, it became clear that nothing had actually been proved. So in order to show that there was some gigantic error in Eutyches, Eusebius felt the need for a profound comment. "He avoided the 'from heaven,'" Eusebius admitted, "but did not say from where." As we have seen in the preceding chapter, Eutyches had very clearly stated during his trial at the Home Synod of Constantinople that Christ's body

---

[1] Mansi VI 633.

[2] See above pp. 46f. for the full statement.

(or flesh) was from the flesh of the Virgin. Therefore, the fault lay, not in Eutyches, but in his accuser. However, it had somehow to be proved that Eutyches had not specified where the body of Christ was from. Now Diogenes of Cyzicus reported his interview with Eutyches during the early sessions of the Home Synod, in order to find out the monk's position on the issue. Diogenes testified that he had received no satisfactory answer. Basil of Seleucia had another story. According to him, Eutyches had replied that he indicated the manner of the Incarnation and the Humanisation, inasmuch as he knew God the Word become man by assumption of flesh (ὥστε εἰπεῖν αὐτὸν τὸν τρόπον τῆς σαρκώσεως καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσεως εἰ κατὰ πρόσληψιν σαρκὸς οἶδε τὸν θεὸν Λόγον γενόμενον ἄνθρωπον). Immediately Dioscorus pointed out that the words of Basil were his own, and that they were not found recorded in the minutes (of Constantinople). However, he added, "if Eutyches holds notions disallowed by the doctrines of the Church, he deserves, not only punishment, but even fire. My concern, however, is for the catholic and apostolic Faith, not for any man whomsoever."[1] Now continuing his statement, Basil said that his affirmation had always been that Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, God the Word, was made known in two natures (ἐν δύο φύσεσιν γνωριζόμενον) after the Incarnation and the Humanisation.[1]

---

[1] Mansi VI 633-636. Quoted above pp.32f. This is the passage on the strength of which Sellers says that Dioscorus pronounced only a "conditional anathema against Eutyches" (op. cit., p. 106, n. 1 and p. 60, n. 1). Sellers

---

seems to be uncritically assuming that the old monk had been justly condemned. As we have seen, this was the position taken for granted by Eusebius of Dorylaeum and most of the bishops assembled at Chalcedon. On this point it was Dioscorus who weighed the evidence carefully.

The statement of Dioscorus may be put in this way. There is no evidence to say that Eutyches had taught the ideas ascribed to him by Basil. In case he taught them, he was a heretic. This is a clear admission by Dioscorus of the fact that the ideas which Chalcedon was trying to exclude were heretical. As for his "conditional anathema against Eutyches," it only shows that Dioscorus was a man of real theological and intellectual ability.

[1] Sellers' judgment that, in its *Definitio*, Chalcedon took over the phrase "made known in two natures" from Basil need not be called in question. (*op. cit.* pp. 105-106, 215-216). Since, however, he implies that, therefore, Cyrilline contribution was availed of by Chalcedon through Basil, we may be reminded of the role this worthy played in the controversy. At the Home Synod of Constantinople he had challenged the μία φύσις as leading to σύγκρασιν and σύγχυσιν (See above p. 41). When the minutes of the Home Synod were read at Ephesus he denied that he had ever made that statement, and advocated μία φύσις (above p.41). Now at Chalcedon he is ready to fight for δύο φύσεις , and that as a disciple of Cyril. It is true that at Chalcedon he tried to convince the assembly that his change of mind at Ephesus was calculated to express his rejection of "Nestorianism." It must be remembered that at the end of the first session, along with five other men, he was also condemned by the commissioners as having been responsible for the Council of Ephesus. The fact, therefore, is that Basil was one of the many Eastern bishops who would sing to the tune of the powerful majority. If he represented Cyril's theology at Chalcedon, one has to feel sorry both

The statement of Basil gave rise to exclamations and counter-exclamations. The Alexandrine party shouted against all mention of "two natures," and the Antiochene party for its exclusive adoption.

This was an occasion when the fact that the Council consisted of two equally strong parties--one for the phrase "two natures" and the other opposed to it--became sufficiently clear. In that situation, however, the party opposed to the phrase received a severe blow by the defection of Basil. For it raised the question, why, in that case, Flavian was condemned. If this is orthodoxy, straightaway asked the commissioners, why was Flavian of pious memory excommunicated?[1] Basil answered that, since there were a hundred and twenty or thirty bishops committed with the task of judgment, he was of necessity constrained to accept their decision.

---

for the great Alexandrine theologian as well as for Chalcedon. In fact, it is no compliment to Chalcedon that the Council was satisfied with Basil's representation of Cyril. For the former's criticism of μία φύσις was itself an indication of the fact that he did not have sufficient knowledge of the latter's theology. For Basil, Christ was at once perfect God and perfect man, and he took the phrase only as a tool to conserve that affirmation. Therefore, Basil's understanding of the phrases was superficial. As we shall see later, though the non-Chalcedonians had several objections to Chalcedon regarding the *Definitio* their only criticism was that it adopted this phrase — "two natures."

[1] Mansi VI 637.

At this stage Dioscorus again interrupted Basil and made a rather sarcastic remark. Now is the Scripture fulfilled, he said, which says, by your tongue you shall be justified and by your tongue you shall be condemned. Being afraid of men do not trespass against the truth, and do not set aside the Faith. Have you not heard of, and avoided, your fall?

Paying little heed to the remark, Basil continued to say that, if it were before secular authorities, he would have made his testimony, that at Constantinople he had shown courage, but that in the case of Flavian, he was not condemned justly. This was enough provocation for the Antiochenes to shout: "We have all sinned. We all ask for pardon."

Now the commissioners pointed out that they had said earlier that they had been forced and compelled to write on blank papers the excommunication of Flavian. However, the Antiochene party again exclaimed that they all had sinned and that they were begging for forgiveness.[1] It is interesting to note that now the bishops did not repeat the story of the blank papers or of terrorism. It may well be that the second request for forgiveness was not for the signatures that they had given, but for fabricating the fantastic story of the blank papers and the city rabble.

---

[1] Mansi VI 641.

The conflagration started by the defection of Basil of Seleucia and "oiled" by the bishops of the Antiochene party did not stop with them. It spread to the ranks of the Alexandrines also. Those among them who were not particularly endowed with the gift of mental strength followed the shouts of the Antiochene side. In this way Thalassius, Eustathius of Berytus, Eusebius of Ancyra and a number of other bishops of the Alexandrine party became struck by remorse and cried out, "We all have sinned. We all beg for pardon."

The reading of the minutes again continued. According to the record, when the Council of Ephesus was dealing with the question of Eutyches, Flavian asked for Eusebius to be heard, as he had been the accuser of the monk.[1] Now at Chalcedon the bishop of Dorylaeum interrupted the reader and complained that this right had been denied to him. The commissioners asked why he had not been permitted to speak. Dioscorus answered that he had not prevented Eusebius, but that it had been done in obedience to the emperor's injunction to Elpidius not to permit Eusebius to participate in the assembly. Juvenal also testified that it was Elpidius who had not let Eusebius speak. Thalassius shirked the responsibility by saying that he had no authority. When an issue regarding the Faith was being discussed, commented the commissioners, this was no excuse. Now Dioscorus observed, "You take me to task as though, in listening to Elpidius, I violated the canons. Now how are the canons in force when Theodoret is here?" "Theodoret is present," replied the commissioners, "in the capacity of accuser." "How, then, is he seated in the order of bishops," asked Dioscorus. "He is seated as the accuser," was the answer, "as you are seated as the accused."

---

[1] Mansi VI 644.

The point of Dioscorus needs a word of explanation. Theodoret had been deposed by the Council of 449, and, as we have seen, no appeal against that action had been made to the Council of Chalcedon yet. However, Leo had already "restored him" on his own authority, and the commissioners tried at the very beginning of the Council to show that Leo's action was the action of the Church. This could not be done because of opposition from the bishops of the Alexandrine party, and immediately the commissioners stated that his presence was in the capacity of an accuser. In other words, Leo and the Antiochenes wanted Theodoret to be present, and the commissioners were ready to do anything in order to please them. In the case of Eusebius at Ephesus, no one at the Council, except Flavian, demanded his presence, and the imperial policy was against it. So the point of Dioscorus was that if what had happened at Ephesus in regard to Eusebius was wrong, what Chalcedon was doing in the case of Theodoret was no better.

How, then, was the demand of Flavian that Eusebius should be heard ~~was~~ set aside at Ephesus? In the extant mandates of Theodosius issued for convening the Council of 449 we do not have a reference to Eusebius. But when Flavian made the demand, it was Elpidius, the imperial commissioner~~s~~, who gave an answer.[1] He stated that the order of the emperor was to the effect that those who had been judges in the case should not have an occasion for defence. This, he made clear, was the answer to Flavian, namely, the accuser had already made his accusation and it was clearly known. Therefore, proposed Elpidius, the bishops should meet and take up the case on the basis of what had been done, without starting everything all over again. In other words, the case should be judged on the strength of the minutes of the Home Synod of Constantinople, rather than on a fresh examination of persons.

And yet the Council of Ephesus adopted this course of action only after an expression of approval by eighteen bishops without any of the others dissenting. So Dioscorus asked the assembly to signify their mind. Juvenal, Stephen of Ephesus, Thalassius, Eustathius of Berytus and thirteen others straightaway agreed that that was the right thing to do. Now Dioscorus specially requested the Roman legates to express their point of view.[1] Julius, through his interpreter Florentius of Lydea, signified that he agreed to the proposal, but added that the Tome of Leo should be read before that. The very fact that Dioscorus requested the representatives of Leo to signify their mind in the matter is a sufficient proof that the bishop of Alexandria did not slight the Roman see, but that his hesitation to read the Tome to the Council was because he could not agree with its theology. So also, on the question of Eusebius the Roman legates had agreed that the case should be taken up on the basis of the Home Synod's minutes alone. We can very well say that Dioscorus could not be taken to have been more responsible for that decision than the other bishops.

---

[1] Mansi VI 645.

The Council of Chalcedon now listened to the minutes of the Home Synod as they had been read at Ephesus. It must be remembered that the Ephesian Council's decision in the case of Eutyches, Flavian and Eusebius was taken after reading the whole series of minutes of the Home Synod.

---

[1] Mansi VI 649.

From the minutes of Constantinople the petition of Eusebius against Eutyches was read at Ephesus. The petition contained a reference to Cyril,[1] and the bishops at Ephesus lost no time in expressing their respect and admiration for the great Alexandrine theologian. "Cyril's memory for ever,"[2] they shouted. "Dioscorus and Cyril have one and the same Faith. The entire assembly so thinks. Cyril's memory for ever. Let him who withholds himself be anathema." "The apostolic see thinks thus," added the Roman legates.

The petition of Eusebius was followed at Constantinople by the reading of Cyril's second letter to Nestorius and the Formulary of Reunion. The third letter of Cyril was omitted. The mention of Cyril again evoked acclamations of extreme loyalty from the bishops at Ephesus. The exclamations of the bishops at Chalcedon belonging to both parties at this time is very important to see how, without raising the specific issue, the Council proceeded with the enquiry, and we shall reproduce them here in full. The Illyrian bishops who were of the Alexandrine party started the shouting.[3] "As Cyril, so we believe," they cried out. "Everlasting memory to Cyril."

---

[1] Mansi VI 652.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 653.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 673.

Seeing that it was impossible to pass by the man whom he had criticised in season and out of season as an Apollinarian heretic, Theodoret kept quiet over the Alexandrine and said, "Anathema to him who affirms two Sons. For we worship one Son, our Lord Jesus Christ the only-begotten.

All the bishops: As Cyril, so we believe. We have believed thus. We believe thus. Anathema to him who does not believe thus.

The Antiochenes: Flavian has believed thus. Flavian has affirmed these (things). Why was Flavian excommunicated? Eusebius has rejected Nestorius. Dioscorus altered this Faith.

If the bishops of the Alexandrine party had any capacity for clear thinking, this was the time for them to raise the specific issue. They, however, did not apparently see it. Instead they shouted, "God has cast out Nestorius." Now the Antiochenes gained their point and began to make their claims one after another. "Leo believes thus," they shouted. "Anatolius thinks thus."[1]

The Alexandrines: We all believe thus. Let not Satan find an occasion. Let not Satan find room.

The Antiochenes: The emperor, the Senate and all think thus.

The commissioners and the entire Council now shouted in unison, "The emperor thinks thus."

---

[1] The fact that Anatolius began to be satisfied with this position only after the death of Theodosius II in 450 was not raised.

The Alexandrines: Thus thinks the whole world. The
(teaching) of the fathers has it well.

Now the Antiochenes became confident of gaining their point and shouted, "Cast out the murderer of Flavian. Cast out the parricide."[1] Again the Alexandrines, without seeing the way things were developing, repeated their empty chorus. "We all believe thus.[2] Many years to the senate. Many years to the emperors. Many years to the orthodox. We all believe thus. Through you peace has been achieved. We all glorify in the orthodox way."

Obviously these friends and associates of Dioscorus were unable to realise that their unthinking shouts were harming both their leader as well as the cause of peace, and that they were playing into the hands of men who were determined to subjugate them. The point soon became clear; for the commissioners asked, "What then was the ground on which you received Eutyches into communion who had held opposite views, and excommunicated Flavian of holy memory and bishop Eusebius who maintained these (views)?" The Alexandrines kept quiet. But Dioscorus required the minutes to be read, as they would make clear the truth of the matter.

---

[1] Mansi VI 676.

[2] There was no charge at Chalcedon, nor even a statement by enemies that Dioscorus had done anything

All these developments at Chalcedon happened subsequent to the reading of Cyril's second letter to Nestorius and the Formulary of Reunion from the minutes of Constantinople as they were read from the Acts of Ephesus. We have now to mention an incident that had taken place at Ephesus immediately after the reading of these documents from the minutes of Constantinople. As we have seen the third letter of Cyril to Nestorius had not been read at Constantinople, but the Council of 449 did not raise its omission as a flaw against the Home Synod. At the same time the point regarding terms was clarified by Eustathius of Berytus.[1] For a correct understanding of Cyril's theology, he observed, his letters to Acacius of Melitene, Valerian of Iconium and Succensus of Diocasarea should be taken in evidence. According to these documents, Eustathius pointed out, Cyril stood by the term μία φύσις σεσαρκωμένη (one incarnate nature), and therefore, that must be the basis of the Council's theology. On this point, as we shall see later, Eustathius was absolutely right.[2]

---

against the person of Flavian except that he opposed the latter's theology. This, therefore, refers only to the deposition of Flavian. The Alexandrines, as we shall see later, demanded the presence of Dioscorus at the Council in its later sessions. So the fault lay in their inability to see the development of things in its proper perspective.

[1] It must be remembered that no one at Ephesus objected to the Formulary of Reunion. As we shall see below pp. 185f. the use of the phrase "two natures" in that document was non-committal.

[2] See below pp. 306f.

However, when this was read at Chalcedon, the Antiochenes shouted: "Eutyches says these (things). Dioscorus says these (things)." The fact is that it was Cyril who had said it. While he was alive, the Antiochenes had characterised him as a heretic; but now they were trying to take him on their side, and to portray Eutyches and Dioscorus as the two men responsible for coining the phrase μία φύσις σεσαρκωμένη. In the light of ideas the Antiochenes were endeavouring to read into Eutyches, Dioscorus made his position still clearer. "We do not speak of confusion (σύγχυσιν)," he said, "neither of division (τομήν), nor of change (τροπήν). Let him who says confusion, change or mixture (σύγκρασιν) be anathema."[1]

The statement of Eustathius read from the minutes of Ephesus and the words of Dioscorus were a hard blow to the commissioners. So they asked the Council to signify its mind on the matter. Let the Synod say whether the canonical letters of Cyril taken in evidence and read at this Council agree with the statement of bishop Eustathius. This was a very shrewd question, because the two Cyrilline writings read at the Council did not, in fact, agree with what Eustathius had stated. No sooner had they finished than Eustathius came to the middle of the assembly and said, throwing forward the Cyrilline writing, "If I stated wrongly, see the writing of Cyril. Let it be anathematised."

---

[1] Mansi VI 677.

The Alexandrines: Eustathius has spoken well. The orthodox has spoken well. Everlasting memory to the illustrious and devout Cyril.

This again was an opportunity for the Alexandrines to make their point. That was spoiled by the trembling Eustathius. The letter of Cyril has it thus, he said. It is therefore unlawful to speak of "two natures;" it should be "one incarnate nature." Having stated this, he tried to water down Cyril. "According to the aforesaid letter of Cyril," he said, "any one who affirms 'one nature' in order to explain away the flesh of Christ which was ὁμοούσιον ἡμῖν was anathema; so also he who speaks of 'two natures' in order to divide the Son of God was anathema." In the case of Flavian, Eustathius testified, he had accepted the Cyrilline position and had presented it to the emperor.

This statement of Eustathius at a time, when the Cyrilline view could be ably presented and the theological basis of the second Ephesian Council defended, was a second blow to Dioscorus and the men still left on his side. For the point was not whether Flavian had maintained the Cyrilline position and presented it to the emperor, but whether the basis on which Eutyches had been condemned was justifiable. If that point were sharply made and if there were a just investigation, all the men condemned including Eutyches could have been acquitted. However, Eustathius was not the man for any such work.

Now the commissioners asked, "Why, in that case, was Flavian deposed?" "I failed," answered Eustathius. The reading of the minutes now continued. When it came to the place where, from the minutes of Constantinople as read at Ephesus, the doctrinal statement of Flavian was repeated, the commissioners required of the bishops to signify their mind whether or not Flavian was orthodox.[1] Immediately Paschasinus, the chief of the Roman delegation, Anatolius of Constantinople, Lucentius, another Roman legate, Maximus of Antioch, Thalassius of Caesarea, Eusebius of Ancyra, and Eustathius of Berytus stated that Flavian was orthodox. This was enough ground for the Antiochene party to shout, "The martyr Flavian believed correctly."

Dioscorus: Let the rest of the minutes be read. I testify thus, he defended "two natures after the union" (δύο φύσεις μετὰ τὴν ἕνωσιν).

Juvenal of Jerusalem: There is harmony between Cyril and Flavian. However, I pray ~~that the rest of the~~

---

[1] Mansi VI 680.

> that the rest of the minutes be read, so that
> we may know the point accurately.

Amidst jeers rising from the ranks of the Antiochene party, the Palestinian bishops expressed their agreement with Juvenal. A few more bishops expressed their view that Flavian had been orthodox.

Our survey of facts thus far will make clear one point. The commissioners were avoiding the specific charge on which Flavian had been deposed, namely he tried to establish as exclusively orthodox the Antiochene phrase "two natures after the union" at the cost of the Alexandrine phrase "one incarnate nature of God the Word." The atmosphere of the Council was clouded with extreme confusion. In the crowd there were a few men who were clear-sighted. The commissioners and the Roman legates were among the determined supporters of "two natures." They had, on their side, a large bloc of bishops supporting the Antiochene party, to enjoy their day of victory. Amidst their gibes and jeers the voice of the Alexandrine party simply could not be heard. In spite of all this, there was one man in the latter party who would not submit to mass hypnotism, and he stood firm in his loyalty to the Alexandrine phrase. But in the crowd of the kind that we have observed what matters is an equally strong-willed party of men to fight gibe with gibe and jeers with jeers. From that point of view, the supporters of Dioscorus had already been weakened. Fear of the emperor and of the triumphant party had reduced them to a state of panic and bewilderment. As we have seen, many of them had showed their weakness and helped the victorious party in their efforts to pass by the specific issue. In that situation Dioscorus made a statement which could have been taken as a basis for a discussion of the point at issue.

> It is clear that Flavian was condemned for saying "two natures after the union" (δύο φύσεις μετὰ τὴν ἕνωσιν). I have passages (χρήσεις) from holy fathers, Athanasius, Gregory and Cyril, in many places, to the effect that (one) ought not to say "two natures after the union" (μετὰ τὴν ἕνωσιν δύο φύσεις), but only "one incarnate nature of the Word." I am being cast out with the fathers. I stand with the fathers in their doctrines. In nothing do I trespass. Their passages I have, not in mere words, nor in bits, but in documents. Even as others have requested, I also require that the rest (of the minutes) be read.[1]

This obviously was an open challenge to the theological basis the Council was assuming. However, the fact is that Dioscorus was as much wrong as his opponents in assuming that there had been an established tradition in the Church against "two natures" and in favour of "one incarnate nature." The writings of the fathers to which he refers, except those of Cyril, were most likely Apollinarian forgeries. Even though both sides took them in those days as genuine works, the fact that they were falsely ascribed to the fathers is a strong argument against Dioscorus.

---

[1] Mansi VI 684.

The Council, however, had no idea of listening to a dissentient voice, and the point raised by Dioscorus may have reverberated within the four walls of the great Church of St. Euphemia, without sinking into any human ear, but melting in the atmosphere. The commissioners ordered the reading of the minutes to continue. It came to the place where there was the record of a statement by Basil of Seleucia that Christ "made known in two natures" should be accepted. According to the record, the Council of 449 immediately shouted against him. "Do not divide the indivisible. It is Nestorius who had thought in this way."[1] Now at Ephesus Dioscorus pointed out that Nestorius was not a lonely figure, but that there were others who were holding his views.[2] Again, according to the minutes, when it was read at Ephesus of Saturnius of Marcianopolis and Aetherichus of Smyrna that they had agreed to the decision of the Home Synod at Constantinople, the latter denied his statement.[1] This report annoyed Aetherichus at Chalcedon, and he tried to make out that his signature had been forcibly extracted by Dioscorus at Ephesus. Immediately he was challenged both by Dioscorus and Thalassius. If the words of Thalassius at Chalcedon are to be believed, Aetherichus was not forced at Ephesus.

---

[1] Mansi VI 685.

[2] Anticipating what we shall be saying at a later stage, it may be stated here that for Chalcedon Nestorius was a lonely figure, and that the Council confirmed his condemnation with as much vehemence as Dioscorus was doing. There was, however, a difference between Chalcedon and Dioscorus, which may be put in this way. Whereas for the former "Nestorianism" was the error of one man, for the latter it was a theological point of view shared by others. On this point, though Dioscorus did not have an appreciative understanding of the Nestorian school, his judgment tallies more with the findings of modern Nestorian studies

From the minutes of Ephesus it was read at Chalcedon of Longinus of Chersonesitum that he had stated his view to be that, in agreement with Cyril and Flavian, he maintained " of two natures after the humanisation." Dioscorus now signified his agreement, and made clear his position once again. "The 'of two,'" he said, "I accept; the 'two' I do not accept."[2]

---

than that of Chalcedon. That there were men in the East who maintained Nestorianism as known in history is a fact. Having accepted the phrase "in two natures" as exclusively orthodox, the Council of Chalcedon should have shown justice in the case of the person of Nestorius.

[1] Ibid., p. 688.

[2] Mansi VI 692. In order to see the way the view of Dioscorus has been misrepresented, we may refer to Hefele on this point. He quotes from Mansi the passage given above in this way: "I accept the expression 'Christ is of two natures' (ἐκ δύο), but not, 'there are two natures' (τὸ δύο οὐ δέχομαι)" (op. cit., pp. 310-311). Dioscorus did not say this. In the context what he seems to have meant by the passage was that, in regard to terms, he was prepared to accept "of two Natures after the Union," but that without the "of" he could

Continuing his statement, Dioscorus said that he was sorry to be defiant. Since, however, it was a question of conviction with him, he could not help being like that. Eusebius now retorted that he had been nearly murdered by Dioscorus, referring to the treatment he had received at Ephesus. Dioscorus answered that both at Ephesus and at Chalcedon his defence was before God. Immediately Eusebius rejoined that he had come up to see his opponent defending himself before law. Paschasinus commented that even this much freedom had not been granted to Flavian at Ephesus. This gave the commissioners an opportunity to say that the present Council should administer justice.

This was followed by the reading of the way Eutyches had been acquitted at Ephesus, and the rest of the minutes of the Home Synod at Constantinople. As we have already treated the ground on which the monk had been exonerated by the Council of 449, we may pass it by. However, in the present context one phrase of the Ephesian Council's minutes as read at Chalcedon needs special mention. Before Eutyches was actually condoned, the bishops at Ephesus in 449 had expressed their view of the matter individually. So Basil of Seleucia attempted to make clear his view. As we have seen, he had tried to press the phrase "made known in two natures." Since it was vehemently opposed, he changed his mind and stated that, in agreement with the

---

not accept "two Natures."

holy fathers at Nicea and Ephesus (431), he anathematised those who would divide the one Jesus Christ our Lord into two natures, Hypostases or Prosopa, that he withdrew his own statement at Constantinople concerning two natures, and that he worshipped the one nature of the Godhead of the Only-begotten made man and become incarnate.[1]

When this report was read at Chalcedon, Basil went back on his word. It is true, he said, that he changed his position at Ephesus where he contradicted his statement already made at Constantinople, but it was because he was forced by Dioscorus through the soldiers, monks of Barsumas and the disorderly mob. Dioscorus now asked him, "Did I force you?" "Yes," answered Basil, "by the help of the crowd."[2] Words of assertion and denial of this kind went on for some time, and the reading of the minutes was resumed.[3] The record indicated that Eutyches had requested the Council to examine the report of the investigation that had been conducted by Silentarius Magnus.[4] Immediately Flavian had stated that the report was false. He complained also that he did not have sufficient freedom to make his point clear. This statement was challenged by Dioscorus, Thalassius, Juvenal and several other bishops. Now after the individual expression of views by a hundred and twelve bishops[1] stating that Eutyches was orthodox and that he should be rehabilitated, the old monk was declared innocent.

---

[1] Mansi VI 828.

[2] Mansi VI 829.

[3] _Ibid._, p. 833.

[4] _Ibid._, p. 832.

If the story of the bishops that they were forced to sign blank papers were true, they would not have individually signified that Eutyches was orthodox and that he should be restored to his former position in the Church. This is a clear indication that the decisions of Ephesus were conciliar. It must be remembered that Theodore of Claudiopolis, Stephen of Ephesus, Basil of Seleucia, and other bishops who tried to throw mud on Dioscorus at Chalcedon had individually declared that Eutyches was orthodox. If we had only their signatures we could have credited their story of terrorism with some amount of truth.

As we have noted, the specific issue at Chalcedon was this. The Home Synod of Constantinople had assumed that "two natures after the union" was exclusively orthodox; and the second Council of Ephesus took it for granted that this phrase was heterodox and that "one incarnate nature" alone was permissible in the light of earlier traditions.

---

[1] Mansi VI 833-861.

However, the fact is that neither of these two phrases had become the universal norm of orthodoxy. In that situation the Council of Chalcedon was faced with the task of discussing the merits and demerits of these two phrases and arriving at a decision on the basis of theological principles. What the Council did was to confirm the Home Synod of Constantinople. As our survey of facts has shown, the commissioners and the triumphant party were determined (a) that the specific issue should not be raised at all, (b) that Dioscorus should somehow be degraded, and (c) that Flavian and Eusebius should in any case be acquitted. Therefore, if we use the Hegelian language, and take the Home Synod and the Council of 449 as thesis and antithesis respectively, insofar as the first session of the Council of Chalcedon was concerned, there is not the slightest evidence that the bishops were even aware of a need for working out a synthesis. Whether or not they addressed themselves to this task in drawing up the Council's Definitio will engage our attention in the next chapter.

Before the reading of the second Ephesian Council's minutes came to an end, it was proved, if proof it was, that Flavian and Eusebius had been unjustly condemned, and that Eutyches had not deserved to be restored to the fellowship of the Church. All the associates of Dioscorus, who had vied with each other in shouting for these decisions, now agreed, with a blush on their faces, that both actions were against the laws of the Church. Thus the Council of 449 was declared anathema.

Behind all these conclusions there lay the theological assumption that the phrase "two natures after the union" was the exclusive hall-mark of orthodoxy. On that questionable assumption the commissioners gave their verdict. Legally trained men, they could rise to a level of justice unattained by the custodians of the "infallible doctrine," and their verdict was fairer than the "inviolable decree" of the "Head of all churches." The verdict was that Dioscorus of Alexandria, Juvenal of Jerusalem, Thalassius of Caesarea in Cappadocia, Eusebius of Ancyra, Eustathius of Berytus, and Basil of Seleucia in Isaurea were the men really responsible for what had happened at Ephesus, and that therefore they should all be deposed.[1]

On the strength of the verdict two conclusions may be legitimately drawn. (a) It recognised the conciliar character of the decisions of Ephesus. This fact should be viewed against the background of the bishops' attempt from the beginning to declare Dioscorus alone as having been responsible for everything that had taken place at Ephesus. (b) Of these six men, we have already seen Thalassius denying the fact that he had any authority over the Council of 449. Basil of Seleucia was the one man whose defection had caused the greatest damage to the cause of the Alexandrine party. And the trembling words of Eustathius had rendered the Alexandrines incapable of making their point. The commissioners, however, held them culpable, implying thereby that they did not believe the words of these venerable Churchmen.

---

[1] Mansi VI 936.

As soon as the verdict was pronounced, the bishops of the Antiochene party were over-joyed. "This is a just sentence," they exclaimed. In other words, the triumphant party declared the verdict congruous with ecclesiastical laws. Their judgment was not contradicted by the other party. For the Illyrian bishops cried only for mercy. "We all have sinned. May we be deemed worthy of pardon," was their reply. The Antiochene party continued:

> Many years to the senate. Holy God, Holy (the) Mighty. Holy the Immortal. Have mercy on us. Many years to the emperors. The ungodly has fled. Christ has deserted Dioscorus. God has deserted the murderer. This is a just sentence. This is a just Synod. This is a just Senate. God has avenged the martyrs.[1]

---

[1] This is the incident of which Kidd writes: "'A just sentence,' exclaimed the assembly; and as it broke up, the bishops raised, for the first occasion on which it is recorded to have been used, the celebrated anthem known as the Trisagion" (op. cit., p. 317). As we have seen, the assembly did not exclaim "a just sentence;" it was the bishops of the Antiochene party who shouted it. The other party accepted defeat and cried for mercy. Kidd

Before the first session of the Council came to a close, the commissioners required of every bishop present to produce in writing at the next session a statement of the Faith, bearing in mind that the emperor believes in accordance with the Faith of the fathers of Nicea and of the one hundred and fifty, with the teaching of Gregory, Basil, Athanasius, Julius, Hilary, Ambrose, the two canonical letters of Cyril produced and approved at the first Council of Ephesus, and the Tome of Leo.[1]

---

seems to give the impression that as the assembly broke up the bishops met together to offer thanks to God. But the fact is that the Council was not breaking up; the Antiochenes shouted immediately after the commissioners' verdict. That they may have used a liturgical hymn need not be doubted. For them, however, it was not a hymn of praise, but the triumphant cry of a victorious army.

[1] Mansi VI 937. The statement of the commissioners in regard to the "two canonical letters" of Cyril is very puzzling. The two letters, they say, were produced and approved at the Council of Ephesus in 431. The letters that answer this description are Cyril's second and third letters to Nestorius. But, as we have seen, the third letter was not even mentioned either at Constantinople or at Chalcedon, except for the implicit reference made to it by Dioscorus. We shall see later that another reference to it was made at the second session of the Council. On the other hand, both Constantinople and Chalcedon read Cyril's second letter to Nestorius and the Formulary of Reunion. It was when the latter was read that the commissioners asked the bishops to signify whether or not Flavian was orthodox. That itself was a letter of Cyril addressed not to Nestorius but to John of Antioch. Therefore, it was impossible that the commissioners would ignore either the second letter or the Formulary. In the light of these facts we have to conclude that the commissioners were taking the Formulary as a letter of Cyril read and approved at Ephesus in 431. So we are entitled to say that the commissioners' knowledge

We shall now pass on to survey the proceedings of the second session of the Council which met on October 10. According to Mansi's list, the participants at this meeting were three hundred and five men.[1] The first session had been composed of three hundred and fifty men.[2] None of the six condemned men were present at the second session, and some of their close friends and suffragans may also have absented themselves.

When all the participants were seated, the commissioners opened the business by pointing out that the previous meeting had rendered justice in the case of Flavian and Eusebius, and requiring the bishops now to take up the subject of drawing up a definition of the Faith in harmony with the three hundred and eighteen fathers of Nicea and the one hundred and fifty.[3] Now the bishops rejoined:

> No one draws up another definition, nor are we doing it. We do not venture to define, because the fathers have taught (what is necessary). They have committed to writing

---

of the conflict that had preceded Chalcedon was nothing but superficial. Legal professionals, they knew that the imperial policy was in support of Leo, and they tried to communicate it effectively. Within the framework of that policy they tried to be fair and just.

[1] Mansi VI 940-951

[2] *Ibid.*, 565-580.

[3] Mansi VI 952-953.

that which is required for salvation. It
is not lawful for us to trespass against them.

Cecropius of Sebastopolis: The Eutychian question has been settled by the letter of archbishop Leo. We shall all subscribe to it.

The bishops:[1] That is what we all say. What is defined is enough. There should be no other definition.

The commissioners again insisted on drawing up a statement of the Faith.

The bishops: We are not writing a statement of the Faith. The canon enjoins on us that what is defined is sufficient. The canon is explicit that another definition should not be made. Let the definition of the fathers remain (inviolate).

Florentius of Sardis: A definition of the Faith should not be written. We shall all accept the teaching of the fathers of Nicea and Ephesus, and the writings of Cyril, Coelestine and Leo.

Having made a statement to the same effect, Cecropius now requested that the Tome be read. The commissioners ruled that the creeds of Nicea and Constantinople[2] be read to the assembly. When that was over,[1] the bishops exclaimed: "This is the Faith of all. This is the Faith of the orthodox. We all believe thus." Aetius announced that there was the letter of Cyril to Nestorius,[2] and also the one from the former to John of Antioch, namely the Formulary of Reunion. In response to the ruling of the Commissioners, these documents were also read.[3] When that was over, the bishops exclaimed:

---

[1] As we shall see in a moment, the bishops of the Alexandrine party had not yet signified acceptance of the Tome. Therefore, the words "the bishops" here and several other places are misleading.

[2] The "Creed of Constantinople" was in all probability the Creed of Jerusalem. If that could be accepted as authoritative, there was no reason why Chalcedon should not draw up a statement of the Faith. Therefore, we do not see much logic in the position of the bishops.

> We all believe thus. The Pope Leo thus believes. Anathema to those who divide and to those who confuse. This is the Faith of archbishop Leo. Leo and Anatolius thus believe. As Cyril, so we believe. Everlasting memory to Cyril. As the letters of Cyril, so we think. Thus we believe. Thus we believe. Archbishop Leo thus thinks. Thus he believes. Thus he wrote.[4]

---

[1] Mansi VI 956-957.

[2] The statement is very clear. Aetius refers only to one letter of Cyril to Nestorius, and the one read was the second letter. The third letter was not read; it was not even mentioned.

[3] Ibid., 960.

[4] These exclamations arose before the reading of the Tome. The Latin version of the Acts preserved by Schwartz points to a clue to get over this problem. And Sellers seems uncritically to ascribe authority to it. (op. cit., p. 109, esp. n. 4). According to the Latin version, when the commissioners mentioned the Tome at the close of the first session, the bishops had signified that they had already read it. But the Greek original of the Acts does not know of such an event. Therefore, this part of the Latin version may be a later addition intended to exonerate the bishops who declared Leo a pillar of orthodoxy without ever hearing his Tome read.

Now the commissioners required the reading of the Tome. This was followed by a reading of excerpts collected from the writings of Hilary, Gregory Nazianzen, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Augustine and Cyril.[1] Regarding these excerpts, two facts have to be mentioned. (a) Among the fathers mentioned, there was not a single Antiochene theologian who had advocated the phrase "two natures." (b) The passages read contained only the idea that Christ was at once God and man. As we have seen, the Council of Chalcedon had no evidence that even Eutyches had ever objected to this affirmation. As for Dioscorus, he had made clear at the first session of the Council that, for him, the Creeds of Nicea and Constantinople were the unquestionable foundation of all orthodoxy; that he remained loyal to all orthodox fathers; that he accepted all the three letters of Cyril, namely the two to Nestorius and one to John of Antioch--the Formulary of Reunion; that he believed Christ to be "of two natures" even after the Incarnation; and that the union did not result in confusion, mixture, change or division. This means that, for Dioscorus, Jesus Christ was perfect in Godhead and perfect in manhood. Therefore, none of the excerpts read contained any idea which Dioscorus, on the strength of these admissions, could not endorse. On the specific issue, namely the phrases "two natures" and

---

[1] Mansi VI 961-973.

"one incarnate nature," the excerpts contained no clue as to which should be used. However, none of the assembled bishops pointed out that fact. The Antiochenes and the Roman legates did not want to admit it, and the Alexandrines other than Dioscorus were too terror-stricken to raise any point effectively. The Commissioners who had most probably committed the flagrant blunder of regarding the Formulary of Reunion of 433 as a document read and approved by the Council of 431 were neither theologians nor even scholars in ecclesiastical studies. The bishops of the triumphant party wanted only to show that their theological position was orthodox, without making clear the connection between their phrase and the excerpts read from earlier Church fathers.

However, with the meekness characteristic of their defeated state,[1] the Palestinian and the Illyrian bishops pointed out three passages from the Tome as raising misgivings in their minds. We shall reproduce here the passages and answers given to them.[2]

> (a) in order to pay the debt of our nature, the divine nature became united to the passible

---

[1] Of the three passages they referred to, one was more important than the other two. The answer they were given regarding it was unsatisfactory. And yet they did not say a word about it.

[2] Mansi VI 972-973.

> nature, so that, as the proper remedy for our ills, one and the same Mediator between God and man, the man Jesus Christ, might be from one (element) capable of death, and from the other incapable.

This, in fact, was not a passage to which any serious objection needed to be raised, and Aetius could refer to a passage in Cyril to show that Leo's teaching was sound.

> Since by God's grace, as Paul says, his own body tasted death for all, He is said to have suffered death for us; not that He had any experience of death in His own nature, for it is madness so to think or speak, but that, as I have said, it was His flesh that tasted death.

The one statement in Leo's Tome which non-Chalcedonians took as destructive of orthodoxy even after Chalcedon was the second passage.

> (b) For each form effects that which belongs to it in communion with the other; the Logos, for instance, performing what is proper to it, and the body what is of the body; the one of these shines out in miracles, and the other succumbs to injuries.

The statement of Cyril pointed out by Aetius in answer to this was:

> There are some sayings which are most certainly God-befitting; others man-befitting; and others belong to a middle position, signifying that the Son of God is at once God and man.

Do these passages mean the same idea? According to Leo, the human nature is such that it performs what is human in communion with the divine nature. So also the divine nature performs what is divine in harmony with the human nature. There are two ideas in this affirmation. (a) Each nature is such that it acts, and (b) it acts in communion with the other. The Cyrilline passage, on the other hand, if we take it in the light of the phrases "of two natures" and "one incarnate nature," means only that the two natures became united and that every action of Christ subsequent to the Union proceeds from the Union. As we view His actions we can distinguish them in the three ways he specifies. However, no one raised a second question on the answer given by Aetius.[1]

---

[1] Sellers' treatment of this point seems to be rather puzzling (op. cit., p. 247). He writes: "And Aetius leaves it to be assumed that, like Cyril, the Pope would have acknowledged that all the sayings. . .whether divine or human, were those of the one Person of the Son of God made man." The point at issue was not whether or not Leo would affirm of Christ one Person, for the Tome definitely says that Christ's Person is one and that it is of God and man (T. H. Bindley, op. cit., p. 228). On the other hand, the question was how far the union of the natures maintained by Leo conserved Cyrilline emphasis. Viewed in this way, the statement of Leo could be taken to mean that each nature performed what is its, and that, in their operation, they expressed harmony. In that case, operation of the natures is prior to the union, and an Alexandrine could not see anything in it except a doctrine of two persons.

Sellers admits that "no Alexandrine teacher would have spoken in this way, and one can well appreciate that Leo's statement must have created a real sense of alarm in the minds of determined anti-Nestorians." Sellers seems to ignore the fact that Leo was as anti-Nestorian as

(c) The third passage from the Tome was:

> Although in the Lord Jesus Christ there is One Person (πρόσωπον) of God and man, yet that whereby injury (ὕβρις) is applicable to both is one thing, and that whereby glory attaches to both is another; for from what belongs to us He has that manhood which is inferior to the Father, while from the Father He has Godhead equal with the Father.

It is in this passage that Leo gave expression to his conception of the communicatio idiomatum. In fact, this confirms the idea contained in the second passage. For each nature performs what is its, and what it performs is applicable to both, because the natures exist in the one Person of God and man. In other words, an Alexandrine could very well say that Leo conceived of the operation of the natures as being prior to the union. To add to this, the term πρόσωπον in this passage might have created difficulties for the Alexandrines.[1] Neither of these problems was really answered when Aetius read from Cyril,

---

Dioscorus, and that, insofar as we have evidence, no one at Chalcedon expressed any "sense of alarm" about the Tome. In their heart of hearts the bishops may have had a sense of alarm, but the fact is that they were powerless to express it.

[1] The Tome was read at Chalcedon in a Greek translation. We are reproducing here a rendering of the Greek. Leo was not responsible for the use of the word πρόσωπον . In the conflict between the two schools in the East, the Alexandrines had been insisting on a hypostatic union, while the Antiochenes maintained that the union was prosopic. For a discussion of this point, see below pp. 336f.

> He became man and did not change His properties, for He remained what He was; for it is assuredly understood that it is one thing which is dwelling in another thing, namely the divine nature in manhood.

When the reading of the excerpts was over, the commissioners enquired, "Is there yet any one who doubts?" "No one doubts," shouted the bishops.

So far as we have evidence, this was the only discussion the Council of Chalcedon witnessed in regard to the Tome of Leo. There must have happened many things of which we have no record. Atticus of Nicopolis, for instance, stated that he had been sick, and would like to have a few days' interval in order to read carefully both the Tome and the third letter of Cyril to Nestorius with the twelve anathematisms. As we have noted, the latter document had not seen the light of day either at Constantinople in 448 or at Chalcedon. Now why did Atticus refer to it? It seems clear that he took it as authoritative. However, nobody said a word about it. At a gathering, where the majority of bishops present had already paid the most glorious tribute possible to Cyril, the silence of the bishops is understandable. Every one, including the Antiochenes and the Roman legates, wanted Cyril to be on the side of the Council. Why, then, was Dioscorus who expressed clearly that he accepted the Formulary of Reunion regarded as an alien? Abruptly the commissioners took advantage of the request of Atticus and ruled that the Council was adjourned for five days, that before the next session of the Council met the bishops might confer with Anatolius of Constantinople and clear their doubts, and that they expected common agreement at the next session. As is clear, the common agreement of which the commissioners spoke was nothing but a unanimous agreement to ignore Cyril's third letter and to accept the Tome of Leo. "We believe this," shouted the bishops. "Among us there is no one that doubts. We have already subscribed." The commissioners pointed out that the conference with Anatolius was meant only for those who had doubts.[1]

When the second session broke up there arose from the ranks of the Antiochene party cries of hatred and violence.

The Antiochenes: The Egyptian to exile.[2]

The Alexandrines: We all have sinned. Have mercy on us all. These words to the orthodox emperor.

---

[1] Kidd takes this as a committee appointed by the commissioners to go into the question of the Faith (op. cit., p. 319). We have no evidence that it was a committee. The commissioners wanted to avoid any discussion on the third letter of Cyril to Nestorius or on the Tome. Anatolius had already shown himself as Leo's right hand man in the East. So they could trust the bishop of Constantinople that he would persuade the "doubters" to make their submission.

[2] Mansi VI 976.

Now the clergy of Constantinople joined the crowd and cried out: "Dioscorus to exile. God has forsaken Dioscorus."

The Illyrians: We all have sinned. . .Dioscorus to the Synod. Dioscorus to the churches. May he not suffer evil on your account.[1]

The Clergy of Constantinople: He who communes with Dioscorus is a Jew.

The Antiochenes: The Egyptian to exile.

The Illyrians: The fathers to the Synod.

The Commissioners: That which has been spoken shall be put in action.

With these words of the commissioners the assembly broke up.

The situation at the end of the second session may be summarised in this way. (a) The Antiochene party was determined to see that Dioscorus was deposed and sent into exile. As we have seen, he was the only man in the Alexandrine party who stood firm till the end without submitting to the Antiochene party. A man who had such strength of will and steadfastness of purpose could at any time be a danger to his opponents. (b) Though most of the Alexandrines had by now demonstrated their willingness to remain docile to the triumphant party, they were not yet ready to give up their friendship for Dioscorus. What they wanted was an amnesty, whereby every one at the Council might give up Eutyches and forget all other condemnations on either side. In hoping for a thing like this the men on the Alexandrine side misjudged the situation as well as their leader. (c) The commissioners had no intention of taking a special action against Dioscorus. They may well have hoped that the bishop of Alexandria would come round in the end, and that the Council would unify the Church.

---

[1] This is a clear indication of the fact that, though these bishops expressed regret over their decisions at Ephesus, they did not want Dioscorus to be specially treated. In fact, they had no misgivings either about his theology or about his person.

As we have noted, the Council had been adjourned for five days on October 10. However, on October 13 a special gathering of a section of the bishops met. It is regarded as the third session of the Council of Chalcedon, and we shall examine in the present context whether it deserves to be so reckoned. The facts about this gathering may be summarised in this way. (a) The commissioners were not present at it.[1] At every session of the Council it was the commissioners who directed the proceedings of the assembly. They opened the discussion, and guided every debate. It was their policy that triumphed on every issue, except the case of the five men associated with Dioscorus in the guidance of debate at Ephesus in 449. And at the end of each session they closed the deliberations with a

---

[1] Their absence has been noted by other scholars. Hefele writes: "They" (the commissioners) "said subsequently that the condemnation of Dioscorus (at this session) had taken place without their knowledge" (op. cit., p. 320). As we shall see later, this historian makes mention of the incident out of context (see below pp. 145f.). He then goes on to comment that from this we must not conclude that the holding of this gathering was not announced to them, but that it is more probable that they absented themselves "in order to avoid the appearance of the imperial authority having deprived the bishops of their liberty." There are three objections to Hefele's conjecture. (a) He does not specify on what ground he makes it. (b) As we have seen, no bishop at the Council wanted a definition of

---

the Faith to be drawn up. However, it was drawn up, and it was because the commissioners wanted it. The men who did it had no reasonable ground to fear that their presence at the gathering which deposed Dioscorus would bring discredit on imperial authority. (c) Dioscorus was the one man more than anybody else to blame the imperial authority. It was his insistent demand that they should be present (See below pp. 129f.). Therefore, Hefele's conjecture cannot be taken seriously.

Kidd has another answer. According to him, the commissioners had given their verdict. Now the bishops were taking up the case of Dioscorus for "ecclesiastical decision" (op. cit., p. 320). In giving this answer, Kidd ignores three facts. (a) This gathering consisted only of two hundred of a total number of three hundred and fifty bishops. (b) The commissioners had given their sentence against six men. Why was the case of Dioscorus alone taken up for "ecclesiastical decision?" (c) This gathering proceeded against Dioscorus on the basis of a new petition. If it was only an "ecclesiastical decision," what was the need for a new petition? In regard to the second fact, three comments may be offered. (a) As soon as the commissioners gave their verdict, the bishops opposed to Dioscorus had shouted that it was a "just sentence." This gathering was not attended by the bishops of the other party. This means that, from the point of view of the bishops who took up the case of Dioscorus, the sentence was already ecclesiastical. (b) If the bishops were planning to take up the cases of all the six men one after another, or all of them together, their action could be justified. They had no intention of doing it. (See below pp. 145f.). (c) The five men condemned with Dioscorus were pardoned on October 17. Therefore, Kidd's answer has also to be rejected.

concluding remark. So their absence at this gathering alone must have had a purpose. (b) Of the three hundred and fifty bishops present at Chalcedon, only two hundred were there at this gathering.[1] (c) It was on the strength of a new petition that this special gathering proceeded against Dioscorus. The new petition was presented by Eusebius of Dorylaeum and the charges in it were also the same, except that he pretended to include more evidence to prove them. The new petition itself is an indication that the accuser as well as the judges were trying to ignore the findings of the earlier investigation. (d) There is still more conclusive evidence against taking this gathering as a session of the Council. This meeting took place between two regular sessions of the Council. It was not announced at the previous session, and neither its convocation nor its decision was formally mentioned at the next session. The regular session that followed read the minutes of the first and second sessions, but not of this gathering. Thus the session after it was a direct continuation of the session before it.

---

[1] Hefele admits this fact. This, according to him, was due to the fact that "those who were friendly to Dioscorus did not appear" (op. cit., p. 320). This admission implies that only two hundred of the three hundred and fifty bishops were in favour of an action being taken against Dioscorus. The remaining one hundred and fifty were later forced to accept the decision, and they may well have done it out of fear. Therefore, the decision was that of a party imposed on the others. We do not have a similar instance in the history of the early Church. The condemnation of Nestorius by the Council of Ephesus, 431, was a party decision, but it was of a very different character. In the first place, there was a charge of heresy against Nestorius which was examined on the basis of his own writings. In the light of modern Nestorian studies, one can say that the Council did not understand Nestorius. In the case of Dioscorus, there was no charge, except the charge against a Council. As for the charge against the Council of 449, the commissioners had decided that six men were to be held responsible for it. Secondly, the basis for regarding the decision of Ephesus in 431 as that of a party is that the Council of 431 arrived at it before John of Antioch and his suffragans were able to be at the assembly. On this point again the fact is that bishops from all other provinces had arrived and that they waited for John and his suffragans for over two weeks. In the end, it was on the strength of a message from John himself bidding the Council to start in case he and the men with him were being late, that the Council actually met (Kidd: op. cit., p. 240). In the case of Dioscorus, the one hundred and fifty bishops who were not present at this gathering had participated at the first session of the Council and many of them appeared at the second session also. When the special gathering met they were all at Chalcedon. Therefore, their absence from the special gathering cannot be taken lightly.

With these facts before us we can conclude that the bishops opposed to Dioscorus wanted to depose Dioscorus alone, that the bishops friendly to the latter were not in agreement with that plan, that the commissioners also were against that idea, and that therefore the bishops avoided both the commissioners and the bishops of the Alexandrine party. Behind all this lay the support, enjoyed by the party opposed to Dioscorus, of Pulcheria and Marcian.

Before we examine the way this special gathering took up and decided the case of Dioscorus, a word about the place of its meeting is necessary here. All the fifteen sessions of the Council were held in the church of St. Euphemia (ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τῆς ἁγίας μάρτυρος Εὐφημίας).[1] This gathering met in the "martyrion" of St. Euphemia (ἐν τῷ μαρτυρίῳ τῆς ἁγίας καὶ καλλινίκου μάρτυρος Εὐφημίας).[2] The two descriptions do not necessarily refer to the same place, though, in opposition to Arendt's view that the "martyrion" of St. Euphemia was a chapel of the great Church, Hefele thinks that it was the church itself.[3]

The assembly on October 13 started its business with a statement of Aetius, an archdeacon of Constantinople and the chief notary at the Council, in which he mentioned the petition of Eusebius of Dorylaeum against Dioscorus, on the strength of which the proceedings of the first session of the Council had been carried on.[4] Then he proceeded to say that there was now another petition of Eusebius, and Paschasinus, the leader of the Roman delegation, ruled that it be read. We may summarise the contents of the petition in this way. (a) Dioscorus holds the same views as (ὁμόδοξος) the heretic Eutyches who had been excommunicated and anathematised. (b) He tried to establish his false teaching forcibly in the Church at the Council of Ephesus by the help of a disorderly mob, whom he brought into the Council. (c) He excommunicated the petitioner and Flavian making a show that it was the act of the Council by signatures collected on blank papers which he filled later. (d) By means of all these actions he violated the Catholic Faith as well as the laws of the Church. Therefore, he should be restrained and his doctrines condemned.[1]

---

[1] Mansi VI 564, 937, VII 1, 97, 117, 180, 185, 193, 204, 272, 293, 301, 313, 424. Regarding one session, the place of its meeting is not mentioned (Mansi VII 357).

[2] Mansi VI 976.

[3] Hefele: *op. cit.*, p.

[4] Mansi VI 984.

The strange thing about the petition is that Eusebius states in it that all these charges were proved by the investigations of the first session of the Council. Of the four points into which we have analysed the charges contained in the petition of Eusebius, the first, namely that Dioscorus was a Eutychian heretic, is a general one. This charge had been made very strongly in his first petition. But in neither of the two petitions had he given any evidence for it, except what had happened at Ephesus. Therefore, in both petitions the charge made against Dioscorus was a charge against a Council. In the present petition Eusebius has tried to make out, on the strength of the story of the blank papers and of the city rabble, that Dioscorus had dominated the Council, and that therefore the bishop of Alexandria was solely responsible for the Council's decisions.

---

[1] For the petition, see Mansi VI 985-986.

In the light of these facts we may make a few observations in regard to the new petition of Eusebius. (1) The effort made by the bishop of Dorylaeum is to assume that the decisions of Ephesus were decisions of Dioscorus forced on the Council. But the ground of his assumption had been investigated at the first session of the Council of Chalcedon, and the commissioners had given their verdict defending, in principle, the conciliar character of the decisions of Ephesus. In this context we may recall the effort made successfully by the Roman legates to exclude Dioscorus from the assembly and the first petition of Eusebius which was in harmony with what they wanted to get done. Therefore, the issue, namely whether the decisions of Ephesus were conciliar or one man's arrogance, had been very prominent at the first session of the Council. In that situation the sentence of the commissioners condemning six men as having been responsible for the decisions of 449 was a blow both to the Roman legates and to Eusebius. The new petition was an effort to get over that defeat.

(2) The story of the city rabble and of the blank papers is the one ground on which Eusebius proceeds. As we have seen, Theodore of Claudiopolis was the man who raised the story of the city rabble. But according to him, the city rabble were called in, not by Dioscorus alone, but by Dioscorus and Juvenal. However, in his new petition Eusebius lays it solely to the charge of Dioscorus. Thus the bishop of Dorylaeum goes beyond what the accuser had stated. As for the charge itself, as soon as it was made, the Egyptian bishops had scorned it, and Dioscorus had expressed his amazement at the way it had been asserted. In regard to the story of the blank papers that goes with it, Stephen of Ephesus who had made no mention of the city rabble,[1] said that the men who had forced the notaries of the bishops to take down Dioscorus' version of the Council's minutes were the latter's notaries. Even this charge had been answered by Dioscorus by calling upon the Council to compare his copy of the minutes with that of Stephen himself. The Council, however, did not do it, and therefore the charge was not taken seriously at all.

In considering the story of the blank papers and the city rabble, it must be remembered that Eusebius did not mention it in his first petition. At the time when the Council of 449 met he was in Ephesus and most probably he attended the assembly; for Flavian pleaded with the Council that the bishop of Dorylaeum should be heard before a decision was reached in the case of Eutyches. If the Council had been conducted so notoriously that the story of the blank papers and the city rabble were actually a true account of what happened, it would not have escaped the notice of Eusebius. However, he did not show any knowledge of it in his first petition. We must ask whether he heard of it for the first time only at the first session of the Council of Chalcedon.

---

[1] It must be remembered that the Council had met in the city of Stephen, and that at Chalcedon he was on the side of Dioscorus' enemies. If the story of the city rabble were a fact, it could not have escaped his notice. Therefore, the fact that he does not mention it raises some question as to the veracity of the story.

(3) We have already noted that the theological assumption of the commissioners' verdict was questionable. Therefore, the conception of justice they evinced by their verdict was also indefensible, though they had tried to be impartial. Now the effort of Eusebius and the bishops with him was to set aside the impartiality sought by the imperial authorities. If, on the other hand, these bishops were really impartial, at the same time being loyal to their theological conviction, they would have taken up the case of all the men condemned by the commissioners either together or one after another, deposing or acquitting whomsoever they decided. But the fact is that in their declaration against Dioscorus the Roman legates stated

that the other men had already been pardoned by, and were in communion with, the Holy See, though their submission and the declaration of the Council's pardon of them took place only on October 17, 451. Therefore, the new petition of Eusebius suggests a determination to ignore the commissioners' verdict which recognised in principle the conciliar character of the Ephesian decisions of 449, and to discredit the person of Dioscorus.

Against the background of these facts, we shall now proceed to treat the way the bishop of Alexandria was deposed by this special gathering. When the reading of his new petition was over, Eusebius required the presence of his adversary to answer his charges.[1] Here again it must be remembered that the effort was not to examine whether the charges were based on facts, but to question him as to why he had committed the outrages listed in them. That the charges were proved was assumed. What was required was to restrain the man who perpetrated them. For that his explanation was deemed necessary.

The assembly spent some time in deciding upon a course of action whereby to bring the accused to the meeting. After a brief deliberation it was decided that a duly appointed delegation consisting of Constantine of Bostra, Acacius of Arearathea, Atticus of Zelos and Himerius, the notary, be sent to summon him.[1] The delegation submitted a report of their interview with Dioscorus, which may be thus summarised.

---

[1] Mansi VI 988.

Constantine delivered the message and Dioscorus answered.

Dioscorus: I am under guard (φυλαττόμαι ἐγώ). Let them say whether I should agree to come down.

Acacius: We are not deputed to the magistrates, but to your Holiness, in order to invite you to the assembly.

Dioscorus: I am ready to come down (ἕτοιμός εἰμι παραγινέσθαι) to the holy and ecumenical Council; but am prevented (κωλύομαι).

Atticus: Bishop Eusebius has presented libels and the great and holy Council has, through us, ordered your Holiness to be present and answer the charges.

Dioscorus: I have already said that I am willing to come (ἅπαξ εἶπον ὅτι προθέσεως κἀγὼ εἰμι τοῦ ἐλθεῖν) to the holy and ecumenical Council; but, as your piety sees, I am prevented.

After reading this report to the assembly, Himerius stated[1] that, while returning to the bishops, they met the assistant master of the guards, and with him they again visited Dioscorus. The report of the conversation that passed between the envoys of the assembly and Dioscorus was now read.

---

[1] Mansi VI 989-992.

[2] Mansi VI 993.

Dioscorus: As I am being summoned and as I know its purpose, I reply thus. At the previous session the commissioners were present and decided every one of the various points. Now the Council calls me a second time with a view to set aside (ἀνασκεύη) what has already been decided. I pray, therefore, that, just as at the former session the commissioners were present, they should be present now also, so that the same points may be again debated.[1]

Acacius: In calling your Holiness, the Council has no intention of setting aside what has been decided in the presence of the commissioners; but it has deputed us to your Holiness, so that you may not be wanting there.[2]

---

[1] We have no means of knowing how Dioscorus assumed that the commissioners were not going to be present. The only clue in the reported words spoken by the envoys is the statement of Atticus that there was a petition against him presented by Eusebius. If that is the only source of information for Dioscorus, the legal basis of our criticism regarding the new petition was grasped by him, and we don't see any flaw in his stand.

[2] The effort of Acacius seems to be somehow to try to persuade Dioscorus to attend the assembly, but he

Dioscorus: You have now told me that Eusebius has presented libels. I pray that the commissioners should be present.

Atticus: We are deputed to your Holiness in order to urge you.

Dioscorus (angrily): I have already given my answer that I wish to have the things concerning me debated again in the presence of the commissioners.

Constantine of Bostra reminded Dioscorus that a little time before he had not raised this point, but only that he had no permission from the magistrates.

Dioscorus: Only now do I realise that the commissioners are not going to be present, and therefore I reply thus.

When Himerius finished reading the report Eusebius was keen that a decision should be reached immediately.[1] Maximus of Antioch, however, suggested that a second summons should be served. Eusebius could not see much point in that. Bishop Dioscorus, he said, is raising excuses, and he will not come to the Council. It is clear, he added, that the subject is different and that should be clear

---

apparently did not realise that Atticus had already told the accused what the purpose of the summons was. It is interesting to note that from now on Dioscorus does not refer to the assembly, though before now he had referred to it twice as the "holy and ecumenical Council."

[2] Mansi VI 996.

to you.[1] We are not setting aside what has already been decided.

The assembly, however, decided that, according to the canon laws, a second summons should be served. This time the delegation consisted of Pergamius of Antioch in Pisidia, Cecropius of Sebastopolis and Rufinus of Samosata. A written summons was sent to Dioscorus through these men, which said that the decisions already reached in the presence of the commissioners were not going to be set aside, but that there was a new petition against him presented by Eusebius. As it contained charges for him to answer, the Council demanded his presence.[2]

---

[1] The two arguments of Eusebius are (a) he is requesting that the case of Dioscorus be taken up on the basis of a new petition, and (b) he does not want to set aside the verdict of the commissioners. This means that the deposition of Dioscorus recommended by the Commissioners should stand, and, in addition, what he demands in the new petition should also be granted.

As we have already stated, the decisions of the Council of 449 were based on the premise that the Alexandrine phrase "one incarnate nature" alone was orthodox. But the concern was primarily theological. The theological premise of Eusebius was that "two natures after the union" alone was orthodox. It was on that assumption that the commissioners had given their verdict. Now for Eusebius, in demanding the imposition of a special treatment on Dioscorus, the concern was primarily personal hatred and animosity.

[2] The assembly itself was not pretending to reach an "ecclesiastical decision" in the case of a man regarding whom a sentence had already been pronounced. The bishops, on the other hand, were proceeding to try a new suit, though the charges it contained were old ones. For the petition of Eusebius, see Mansi VI 997.

Pergamius delivered the summons and Dioscorus answered.[1]

Dioscorus: I have already made it plain to your piety that I am sick and that I demand the presence of the commissioners on the present occasion also, so that the matters at issue may be investigated. Since, however, my sickness has increased, on this ground alone I withhold my presence.

Cecropius now reminded him that he had not made mention of sickness before but only of desiring the presence of the commissioners, and that therefore he should satisfy the requirements of the canon laws.

Dioscorus: I have said once and for all that the commissioners should be present.

Rufinus stated that the matters mooted were under canonical regulations, and that on his appearance he would be free to make whatever statements he chose.

Dioscorus immediately asked whether Juvenal, Thalassius, Eusebius, Basil and Eustathius would be present.[2]

---

[1] Mansi VI 1,000.

[2] The context in which Dioscorus raised this point seems to us to be significant. It was in response to the statement of Rufinus that the matters mooted were under canonical regulation. In that context the demand of Dioscorus may have meant a calling in question the legality of the procedure. If it were under canonical regulation, so Dioscorus may have meant to say, all the condemned men should be present when the Church's decision on the earlier verdict was going to be pronounced, and the commissioners should be present to examine a new suit.

Pergamius: The holy and ecumenical Council has not enjoined on us to answer the query your Holiness has made. We are asked to convey to you the second canonical summons of the Council, and we have done it properly.[1] Now it is for your Holiness to respect the demand of the Council.

Dioscorus: These things I say now. I pray our devoted and Christ-loving emperor that, as on the previous occasion, the commissioners as well as the bishops who were with me should be present in deciding the suit of Eusebius.

Cecropius: Eusebius has accused you only. Therefore the presence of the others is not necessary. Since everything will be done in accordance with the canon laws, neither the commissioners nor any lay men need to be present,[2] nor even the others.

Dioscorus: In praying to the emperor, I have already signified my wish that the other bishops who were with me should be present, because the suit of Eusebius does not affect me personally, but it rested in fact upon a judgment in which we all were involved. Now Pergamius and Cecropius together stated again that the petition of Eusebius was against Dioscorus alone, and that the former required the presence of the latter.

---

[1] Mansi VI 1,001.

[2] At the Council of Nicea an unbaptised Constantine had played a definite role. Had not Constantine collected the many petitions against one another presented to him by the assembled bishops and burned them in the context of an oration on unity, the Council of 325 would have been a scene of civil war among Churchmen. At the Home Synod of Constantinople Florentius, a layman, played a significant part which we have observed. At Chalcedon itself, every one of the fifteen sessions was attended and directed by the Commissioners. In the case of Dioscorus alone these bishops did not want them to be present. Why?

Dioscorus: What I have said, I have said once and for all; and I have nothing further to say.

When this report was read to the assembly, Eusebius was ready with his affirmation that his petition concerned Dioscorus only, and he requested a third summons be served.[1] Aetius now announced that there were petitions against Dioscorus from presbyter Athanasius, deacon Theodore, deacon Ischyrion and a layman Sophronius--all from Alexandria. These men were called in, and were permitted to speak. The point which Ischyrion made in his oral statement was of some weight. "It must be known," he said, "that bishop Eusebius was not the only accuser of Dioscorus, but that there were others also who have grievances against him."

Now bishop Lucentius required the reading of these new petitions, and all four of them were read.[1] When the reading was over, the assembly said:[1] "These petitions have all of them shown what has been perpetrated. It is clear that what has been read has brought complaints against bishop Dioscorus." "What has been read is clear," said Florentius of Sardis, "and bishop Dioscorus should be summoned the third time." Paschasinus also spoke to the same effect. Thereupon, in response to a proposal made by Aetius, a delegation was appointed consisting of Phrancius of Philippopolis in Thrace, Lucian of Beza, John of Germanicia and deacon Palladius as the notary. A written summons was sent through them.

---

[1] Mansi VI 1,001-1,004.

[2] For the text of the petitions, see Mansi VI 1,005-1,035. Kidd believes that the assembly took no notice of these petitions (Kidd, III, p. 320). He does not seem to have realised that the story of Leo's excommunication by Dioscorus was contained in one of these petitions, and

It started by listing the several reasons which Dioscorus had raised against his coming to the assembly. In the first place, that he was under arrest; secondly, that he wanted the presence of the commissioners; thirdly, that he was sick; and fourthly, that he prayed to the emperor for the presence of the other bishops who had been sentenced with him. The summons now went on to answer the last one alone on two grounds. (a) The other bishops were

---

that it was the basis of a charge raised against him by the Roman legates. Not only that, in the third summons served to Dioscorus there is a reference to them, and Dioscorus was required to answer the charges which they contained. Therefore, both the Roman legates and the assembly of bishops took the petitions seriously.

[1] Mansi VI 1,036.

not really responsible.[1] (b) As for his prayer to the emperor, he was reminded that he was summoned not by the emperor, but by the most holy and ecumenical Council. The purpose of the summons is to examine the petition of Eusebius as well as those presented by Athanasius, Theodore, Ischyrion and Sophronius--clergy and laity of Alexandria. Now the Council summons him for the third time, through officially appointed delegates.[2]

The report of the delegation was to this effect. The summons was delivered by Phrancius.[3]

Dioscorus: I have made sufficiently clear to your piety that I am unable to come. For I am satisfied with that.

Lucian tried to impress on him that the great Council was confident that he would attend and answer the charges, that the charges were many, that the canon should be respected, and that this was the third summons.

Dioscorus: What I have said, I have said; namely that I am unable to be present.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, 1037. This is the place where the assembly itself unequivocally expressed itself that the decisions of Ephesus had not been conciliar, but of an individual forced on a Council.

[2] For the summons, see Mansi VI 1,036-1,037.

[3] *Ibid.*, 1040.

John of Germanicia: What had been decided three days ago in the presence of the commissioners was not going to be set aside, but you are being summoned to examine the new charges.[1]

Dioscorus: These three times I have been saying the same (things). Because of the same reasons I am not coming.

Phrancius: It is essential that we bring you to the holy Synod and you answer the charges, so that what has taken place may be made manifest to God.

Dioscorus: Again I say the same (things). I do not intend to come.

Lucian: Many charges have been made against your Holiness at the Council. Come and show that you are not guilty of them.

Dioscorus: Why are you pressing me to say otherwise? I declare the same determinations (of mine).

John: We are not pressing. The Synod is great, ecumenical and holy. We believe that, if you refute the charges of Eusebius and those presented today, the Church of God will be rid of bad reputation.

Dioscorus: The Catholic Church has no blemish. May it not be otherwise. For I know how I have come to be singled out (ἐγὼ γὰρ οἶδα, πῶς προσῆλθον ταῖς ἀποκρισέσιν)

---

[1] Mansi VI 1,041.

John: The sins of priests is a common disgrace. If it is known to your Holiness that the accusation is false, the holy Synod is not far; expose it and bring to light that which is contrary to truth.

Dioscorus: What I have said, I have said. And I am satisfied with that.

Having listened to this report, the assembly of bishops decided unanimously that Dioscorus deserved to be punished canonically for disobeying the threefold summons of the holy and ecumenical Council. Prior to the pronouncement of sentence a large number of the assembled bishops expressed their view concerning Dioscorus. The declaration made in this context by the Roman legates may be reproduced here, so that we may see the charges they had against the accused.[1]

> The aggressions committed by Dioscorus, lately bishop of the great city Alexandria, in violation of canonical order and the constitution of the Church, have been clearly proved by the investigations at the former meeting,[2] and the proceedings of today. For, not to mention the mass of his offences, he did, on his own authority, admit to communion his partisan (ὁμόδοξον)Eutyches,[3] after he

---

[1] Mansi VI 1,045-1,048.

[2] The fact, as we have seen, is that not a single thing had been proved against Dioscorus alone.

[3] For this story, see above pp. 23f.

(Eutyches) had been canonically deposed by his own bishop, namely our sainted father and archbishop Flavian; and this before he sat in Council with the other bishops at Ephesus. To them, indeed, the holy see granted pardon for the transactions of which they were not the deliberate authors,[1] and they have hitherto continued obedient to the most holy archbishop Leo,[2] and the body of the holy and ecumenical Council; on which account he also admitted them into communion with him, as being his fellows in faith. Whereas Dioscorus has continued to maintain a haughty carriage, on account of those very circumstances over which he ought to have bewailed, and humbled himself to the earth. Moreover, he did not even allow the epistle to be read[3] which the blessed pope Leo had addressed to Flavian of holy memory, and that too notwithstanding he was repeatedly exhorted by the bearers, and had promised with an oath to that effect. The result of the epistle not being read, has been to fill the most holy churches throughout the world with scandals and mischiefs.[4] Notwithstanding such presumption,

---

[1] That by the reading of the Ephesian Council's minutes this had not been proved was the meaning of the commissioners' verdict.

[2] Exactly six months before the day, when the Roman legates made this statement, Leo himself had admitted that this was not the case. For on April 13, 451, Leo wrote to Pulcheria and Anatolius that "the real authors of the mischief were Dioscorus and his abettors Juvenal and Eustathius of Berytus" (Kidd, III, p. 312).

The truth of the matter is that these five men and their friends and associates were with Dioscorus till October 8, 451, when the Council opened its sessions. It was only on October 17, 451, that they made their submission.

[3] For the discussion on this point at Chalcedon, see above pp. 71f.

[4] The result of the letter having been read at Chalcedon was not much different. The fact is that it was an age in which both parties suspected each other so

> however, it was our purpose to deal mercifully with him. But inasmuch as he has, by his own subsequent conduct, overshot his former iniquity and has presumed to pronounce excommunication against Leo, the most holy and pious archbishop of great Rome.[1] Since, moreover, on the presentation of many petitions against him to the holy and great Synod, he refused to appear, though once, twice and thrice canonically summoned by the bishops, pricked no doubt in his own conscience,[2] and since he has unlawfully received those who had been duly deposed by different synods,[3] he has, in this way, by variously trampling upon the laws of the Church, given his own verdict against himself.
>
> Wherefore, Leo, the most blessed and holy archbishop of the greater and elder Rome, has by the agency of ourselves and the present Synod, in conjunction with the thrice-holy and all-honoured Peter, the Rock of the Catholic Church and the Foundation of the orthodox Faith, deprived him of all the episcopal dignity, and severed him from every priestly function. Accordingly, this holy and great Synod decrees the provisions of the canon on the aforesaid Dioscorus.[4]

---

much that patience was the only safe course of action for either side. Neither side, however, was willing to have recourse to it.

[1] For this story, see above pp. 54f.

[2] In the story of the summons which we have delineated the evidence we have is not that Dioscorus was stricken in conscience, but that he challenged the legality of the procedure adopted against him by the bishops. Even on the assumption that the phrase "two natures after the union" was the exclusive norm of established orthodoxy the attempt of these bishops to proceed against Dioscorus alone was unjust. Omitting all the verbiage in this declaration it contains only two unproved personal charges against him, namely that he admitted Eutyches into the communion of the Church and that he excommunicated Leo.

[3] This charge is very puzzling. Did Dioscorus defend anyone except Eutyches?

[4] The declaration is clear enough. According to it,

This declaration was followed by expression of views by the various participants beginning with Anatolius of Constantinople. In the end, the assembly passed its verdict which we have already reproduced in another context.

This is the way Dioscorus was deposed. In our comments during the delineation of this painful story we have had occasions to indicate our judgment on the various issues. In the light of that we may say (a) that the deposition of Dioscorus was the result of personal hatred; (b) that his enemies assumed a phrase to be exclusively orthodox, but it had never been so recognised before; (c) that even on that assumption his deposition was unjust; and (d) that, therefore, the charge neither of heresy nor of schism can legitimately be laid to those who have supported his position.

---

the deposition of Dioscorus was the decision of the bishop of Rome. The Council adopts it and "decrees the provisions of the canon" against the condemned.

One might be safe in saying that Leo's understanding of the nature of the controversy in the East was rather superficial, and that he had not comprehended the meaning which the Alexandrines had ascribed to their phrase "one incarnate nature." This may have led him to insist on the phrase "two natures." But his intolerance of the former phrase, in spite of its continued use by Cyril, can be understood only against the background of his claim of supremacy for his see, expressed effectively by his legates.

Chapter Three

The Council's *Definitio* and Dioscorus' Protest

The plan of Dioscorus' enemies was successfully carried out. Whether or not all the three hundred and fifty bishops subscribed to the decision,[1] it is clear that not one of the bishops openly expressed disagreement. The Roman legates had one goal to achieve, namely to get the *Tome* of Leo declared a document of the Faith, and the commissioners wanted a Statement of the Faith consonant with its language to be drawn up. The victorious party had prepared the way for it, and on October 17 the third regular session of the Council met in the presence of the commissioners.

As we have already noted, the bishops had shown themselves unwilling at the second session of the Council to draw up a definition of the Faith; but the commissioners were insistent that it should be done. During the third and fourth sessions which met on October 17 and 22 no voice was heard against the drawing up of a statement; neither was there any opposition to the Tome. In fact, the Eastern bishops, under the leadership of Anatolius, had availed themselves of the commissioners' ruling that the "doubters" should meet with the bishop of Constantinople, and had done two things. On the one hand, they had agreed to accept the Tome, and on the other, they had made a draft statement to be approved by the Council. We shall summarise here the way the Tome was accepted.

---

[1] In Mansi's list of signatories, including those who subscribed at a later stage, we have only two hundred and seventy-three names. (Mansi VI 1,080-1,094)

The commissioners opened the business of the meeting by reminding the bishops of the decisions reached at the first and second sessions.[1] The minutes of the two earlier sessions were also read. It must be remembered that not a word was spoken at this stage about the special gathering of bishops that had deposed Dioscorus on October 13, nor were its minutes read. We shall find a reference to it at a later stage. The Council was now thrown open for the bishops to express their views regarding the subject of the Faith.

As might be expected, the Roman legates took the lead. As their spokesman, Paschasinus made a statement.[2] "The Creeds of Nicea," he said, "and Constantinople,[3] the decree of the Council of Ephesus in 431 and the Tome of Leo which condemns both Nestorius and Eutyches should be the inviolable foundation of the Faith."[1] "We all believe thus," exclaimed the bishops. "We were all baptised thus." Now starting from Anatolius, about a hundred and sixty bishops, including Atticus of Nicopolis who had misgivings about the Tome at the second session of the Council, individually signified that they accepted the position stated by the Roman legates.[2] There was no dissentient voice.

---

[1] Mansi VII 5.

[2] Mansi VII 9.

[3] This is the first time in history, so far as we have evidence, when the Council of Constantinople in 381 was mentioned to have drawn up a creed.

When so many bishops had expressed their acceptance of the Tome, with no one raising any objection, the commissioners asked whether the rest of the men who had not individually signified their agreement with the "definition of the fathers" would do so by joining in a common acclamation.[3] "We all accept," shouted all the bishops, "we all agree. We all believe alike. We all think the same (things)." Continuing their shouts, the bishops now started asking for the readmission to the Council of the five men condemned with Dioscorus.

---

[1] The Formulary of Reunion of 433 which was the theological foundation of the Home Synod of Constantinople is not mentioned by the Roman legates. They may have deliberately omitted it, as the "Apostolic see" was not a party to it.

[2] For the individual expression of the views of bishops, see Mansi VII 9-45.

[3] Mansi VII 48.

> The fathers to the Synod. Those who are of the same Faith, to the Synod. Those who have subscribed, to the Synod. Many years to the emperor. Those who think alike, to the Synod. Many years to the emperor. The five who have subscribed (ὑπέγραψαν), to the Synod. As Leo, so they think. Many years to the emperor.

Since the bishops shouted that the five men should be welcomed back to the Council, the question of the condemned men came up. Now the commissioners made a statement. "We have referred their question," they said, "to the emperor, and are awaiting his reply. As for your excommunication of Dioscorus and your decision to readmit the other five, both the emperor and we are ignorant of it. For everything that has been done at the holy Synod, it (the Synod) shall be responsible to God."[1]

---

[1] We have already noted a reference to what the commissioners said about Dioscorus in Hefele in a different context (above, p.118, N.1). In the present context the Roman Catholic historian quotes only these words. "We have written on their account (those five) to the Emperor, and await his commands. You, however, are responsible to God for these for whom you intercede, and for all the proceedings of this Synod." (op. cit., p. 332) In order that the reader may have a chance of comparing the Greek original with our rendering as also with Hefele's, we may give it here in full. ἀνηνέγκαμεν τῷ θειοτάτῳ καὶ εὐσεβετάτῳ ἡμῶν δεσπότῃ περὶ αὐτῶν· καὶ ἀναμένομεν τὴν ἀπόκρισίν τῆς αὐτοῦ εὐσεβείας. ἡ δὲ εὐσέβεια ἡ ὑμέτερα, καὶ περὶ Διοσκόρου τοῦ παρ' ὑμῶν καθαιρεσθέντος, ἀγνοούσης καὶ τῆς θειοτάτης κορυφῆς, καὶ ἡμῶν, καὶ περὶ αὐτῶν τῶν πέντε, ὑπερ ὧν τὴν παράκλησιν ποῖεισθε, καὶ πάντων τῶν πεπραγμένων ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ συνόδῳ, δώσει λόγον τῷ θεῷ.

In reply, the bishops shouted, "God has deserted Dioscorus. Justly has Dioscorus been condemned. Christ has deserted Dioscorus." In this way the Council confirmed the deposition of Dioscorus. Since the Council was on the side of God, justice and Christ, it could have nothing to do with a man whom all the three had deserted. So Dioscorus was abandoned.

In regard to the other men, there came an order from the emperor after a few hours, leaving the matter to the decision of the bishops. The commissioners announced to the assembly the gist of the imperial mandate. Triumphantly, Anatolius requested that the men be welcomed back to the Council. "We request that they come in," shouted the assembly. "Those who are of the same Faith, to the Synod. Those who have subscribed to the letter of Leo, to the

---

In this brief passage Hefele commits at least three errors. (a) He omits all reference to Dioscorus. As we have seen, he makes that reference in a different context. (b) The commissioners did not say that they had written to the emperor about five men only. Since, as they testified, they had not known about the bishops' action in the case of Dioscorus, their request must have been for a judgment on all the six men. It may well be that this knowledge leaked out to the powerful party and that they took action on Dioscorus. (c) The commissioners did not say that the bishops should be responsible for "the proceedings of this Synod." What they said was that the bishops would be responsible for the five men as well as for what had been done in the case of Dioscorus. This is clear from the perfect participle-- πεπραγμένων --that they use, and also from the exclamations of bishops that followed this statement.

Synod." "Let them in,"[1] said the commissioners. When the five men came in, the assembly was all in joy. "God has done this," they shouted. "Many years to the emperor. . . . This is perfection of unity. This is peace for the churches."

The two decisions now taken, namely the acceptance of the _Tome_, and the confirmation of Dioscorus' deposition, put the Egyptian bishops in a very delicate situation. Suffragans of the condemned, they knew that the Council's decisions were not going to be endorsed by the Church in Egypt, and therefore, in order not to commit themselves to anything, they submitted a petition which was read to the assembly.[2] From the beginning, they affirmed,

> we have inherited the orthodox Faith from the fathers--the evangelist Mark, the martyr, Peter, Athanasius, Theophilus and Cyril--and have remained loyal to it. We hold the Faith of Nicea, of Athanasius and of Cyril. We condemn all heresies--of Arius, Eunomius, Manes, Nestorius and those who say that the body of our Lord was from heaven and not from the Virgin Theotokos. And we affirm that He was like us (ὁμοιότητα) in everything except sin.

The statement in the petition contained no mention of the _Tome_, neither did it condemn Eutyches by name.[3] As we have noted, their obvious purpose was to keep away from accepting either the Tome or the deposition of Dioscorus. But the petition was read to an assembly of bishops who had assumed that a charge of heresy had been proved against Eutyches, and who had formally ratified the letter of Leo. If, therefore, the Council gave them permission to be satisfied with the statement which they made, it would have contradicted the two decisions already reached. And one after another the leading bishops at the Council insisted on their making these two points clear. "They are Eutychians," shouted the assembly of bishops. After much heated talk, the Egyptians said, "If any one holds notions contrary to what has been stated, whether Eutyches or any body else, let him be anathema."[1] As for the Tome, they pointed out that they could not accept it without the consent of their archbishop. "They are lying," shouted Eusebius of Dorylaeum. Other bishops soon followed suit. "Anathematise Dioscorus," shouted one of them. In the end the Egyptians yielded; "Anathema to Eutyches and those who believe with him," they said.[2] The assembly went on to gain the second point, namely to secure their acceptance of the Tome. Without the consent of their archbishop, repeated the Egyptians, they were not able to do it. The demand of the assembly, however, ceaselessly continued.

---

[1] Mansi VI 49.

[2] _Ibid._, 49-52.

[3] In the light of what we have seen in regard to the condemnation of Eutyches (above pp. 42f.), it may well be that the Egyptian bishops were unable to understand how the old monk could be so treated.

---

[1] Mansi VI 53.

[2] Ibid., 56.

The Faith contained in their Statement, pleaded the Egyptians, was orthodox, and stated again their reason for not accepting the *Tome*. The assembly would not give up. The ecumenical Council is greater than the archbishopric of Egypt and therefore they should subscribe, argued one of the bishops.[1] The Egyptians now began to cry for mercy. "We will be killed when we return to our country," they said. "Be martyrs for the Faith," retorted the bishops at the Council. "We shall die at your feet, not in Egypt,"[2] cried the Egyptians. The pandemonium was at last quieted by the intervention of the commissioners, who suggested that the business be suspended till an archbishop was appointed for Egypt.[3]

In this way the *Tome* was accepted at Chalcedon as an essential condition of membership in the Church. Those who did not accept it, so the argument went, were Eutychian heretics.[4] The Council of 449 had found the *Tome* so unacceptable that none of the leading bishops there wanted that the document even be read. At Chalcedon itself, on October 10, the Illyrian and the Palestinian bishops had raised three objections to the Tome, of which one at least was fundamental.[1] Atticus of Nicopolis had misgivings both about the Tome and about the omission of Cyril's third letter to Nestorius with the anathematisms. How, then, did the Tome come to be acclaimed as a condition of membership in the Church on October 17? One possible answer is that Anatolius fulfilled his task successfully in clearing these men of their misgivings about the Tome. It is true that the bishop of Constantinople was responsible for their change of mind. However, it must be remembered that these men passed from a stage of doubt regarding the Tome to one of declaring it a document indispensable for Church membership. In this they underwent two changes. On the one hand, they admitted that the Tome was orthodox, and on the other, that it was an inviolable foundation of the Church's Faith. The second position is very striking. How could they assume that?

---

[1] Mansi VII 57.

[2] *Ibid.*, 60.

[3] The archbishop appointed for Egypt by Chalcedon was Proterius. We shall see below (pp. 201f.) how much hold he obtained on the Church in that country.

[4] This was the argument against the Egyptian bishops (Mansi VII 52, 53).

This question can be answered only by taking into account the fact that Anatolius had not only led these men to accept the Tome, but had also drawn up a statement of the Faith with the whole-hearted approval of these Eastern bishops. Since its text has not been preserved, we do not know what kind of a document it was. Regarding it, however, we are certain of the following facts. (a) It was read at the fourth session of the Council which met on October 22. (b) It was opposed by the Roman legates in the severest way possible. (c) Some bishops of the Antiochene party also were not satisfied with it, and John of Germanicia expressed that point of view. (d) The commissioners who were very keen on the *Tome* being accepted were critical of its adequacy. (e) In regard to the crucial point of terms, it contained only "of two natures."

---

[1] See above pp. 111f.

Before we attempt to answer the question how the *Tome* came to be accepted by the Eastern bishops who had misgivings about it, we shall examine the tenacity with which they tried to have their draft statement approved by the Council as its formal definition of the Faith. The fourth session of the Council which met on October 22 was declared open by the commissioners who required the bishops to take up the subject of the Faith.[1] Now Asclepiades, a deacon of Constantinople, read the draft statement. When he finished its reading, John of Germanicia raised objection to its being accepted. Anatolius, however, came forward to push it through.[2] "Does the definition satisfy you?" he asked the assembly. Immediately all the bishops, except the Roman legates and some Orientals, shouted:

---

[1] Mansi VII 100.

[2] *Ibid*., 101.

The definition is satisfying to the Faith. This is the Faith of the fathers. He who thinks in opposition to these [things] is a heretic. Whoever thinks differently, let him be anathema. Cast out the Nestorians. This definition is adequate [to conserve] the Faith. He who does not anathematise Nestorius, let him go out of the Synod.

Anatolius: Was the definition of the Faith satisfying to all yesterday?

The bishops: The definition was satisfying to all. We do not believe differently. Anathema to him who believes otherwise. This is the Faith of the fathers. The definition was satisfying to God. This is the Faith of the orthodox. The Faith shall not suffer mutilation (δόλον). Let it write that the holy Mary is Theotokos. In the definition it shall add this.[1]

Thoroughly disillusioned, the Roman legates made a statement. "If they do not," they said, "agree with the letter of the apostolic man, the most blessed bishop Leo, permit us to tender our resignation, so that we may go back and hold a synod there." The commissioners would not let that happen. So they suggested a practical method of arriving at a decision. "If it pleases your piety," they said, "let six bishops from the Orient, three from Asia, three from Pontus, three Illyrians and three from Thrace meet with Anatolius and the Roman legates and draw up a definition satisfying to you." "The definition was satisfying to all," shouted the bishops. "These voices to the emperor. This is the definition of the orthodox."

---

[1] On the basis of this and a later statement Sellers thinks of the definition that it did not have the term "Theotokos" (*op. cit.*, pp. 116-117). This reading of his need not be doubted. In fact, there is a third passage in which the bishops shouted later: "Remove a defect of the definition," though Sellers does not take account of it.

John of Germanicia now went to the commissioners, apparently for a private talk. Seeing him, the bishops continued.

> Cast out the Nestorians. Cast out the fighters against God. . . . Yesterday the definition was satisfying to all. The emperor is orthodox. The empress has driven out Nestorius. The commissioners are orthodox. Yesterday the definition satisfied all.[1] Many years to the commissioners. We would like the definition to be signed upon the Gospels. It was satisfying to all. Order [them] to sign the definition. No mutilation shall be allowed in the Faith. He who does not sign the definition is a heretic. Holy Mary is Theotokos. He who does not think in this way is a heretic. The orthodox commissioners keep the Faith. Orthodox emperors! Orthodox commissioners! The definition should not be opposed. The Holy Spirit has dictated the definition. The definition is orthodox. Straightway let the definition be subscribed. He who does not subscribe is a heretic. Cast out the heretics. The Virgin Mary is Theotokos. Cast out the heretic. The definition shall add that Mary is Theotokos. Cast out Nestorius. Christ is God.

The commissioners, instructed probably by John of Germanicia[2] who had gone to them, began to argue with the bishops. "Dioscorus has stated that Flavian was deposed because he affirmed 'two natures'; but the definition has 'of two natures.'" Anatolius answered this challenge by stating that Dioscorus had not been condemned on a point of the Faith.[1]

---

[1] Mansi VII 104.

[2] Sellers suggests that the commissioners did this instructed probably by the Roman legates (op. cit., p. 119), but he does not make clear his basis.

There was no difficulty for the commissioners to expose the extreme shallowness of Anatolius and his vociferating colleagues. "Have you not accepted the letter of archbishop Leo?" they asked. "Yes," answered the bishops. "We accepted and subscribed to it." "But what it contains," added the commissioners, "is not included in this definition."

This argument was legitimate and sound. It, however, did not convince the bishops. They shouted, "Another definition should not be drawn up. No one abandons this definition." "Another definition should not be made," cried out surprisingly enough Eusebius of Dorylaeum, the most implacable enemy of Dioscorus. "The definition has confirmed the Tome," exclaimed the bishops.

> Archbishop Leo believes as we believe. Let him sign this definition. This definition is for all. The definition contains the Faith. Leo's views are those of Cyril. Coelestine has confirmed [the views] of Cyril. Xystus has confirmed [the views] of Cyril. One Baptism, one Lord, one Faith. Remove a defect of the definition.

Now on the strength of an imperial order the commissioners tried to bring the bishops to a frame of mind susceptible to reason, by again suggesting a committee.[2]

---

[1] We have already referred to this statement (above p. 31).

[2] Mansi VII 105. The demand, it must be remembered, came from the entire Eastern episcopate, with the exception

Still the bishops were not satisfied. "Many years to the emperor," they exclaimed. "Either let him accept the definition, or we depart. Many years to the emperor." This threat was voiced more clearly by Cecropius of Sebastopolis, one of the men who had served as an envoy to summon Dioscorus to his ecclesiastical scaffold. "We think it fitting," he said, "that the definition be read, so that those who are opposed to it and cannot sign may leave. We are agreed that it is acceptable. There is no one among us who disputes." The Illyrian bishops who had raised objections to the Tome at the second session of the Council and who apparently still believed that it was a document good only for "Nestorius" gave free expression to their mind. "Those who are opposed to it," they said, "as has been made clear, are Nestorians. Let them go to Rome."

These bishops, with their leader Anatolius, had not realised that there was laughable inconsistency in their position. They had accepted the Tome of Leo and condemned Dioscorus who would not endorse it, simply because it contained the one phrase which they were trying to

---

of some Orientals. Sellers comments that the suggestion of a Committee was intended by the emperor to avoid "all suspicion of tyranny" (op. cit., p. 119). It is true that neither Marcian nor Pulcheria had the calibre of Justinian or of Theodora. At the same time, the fact has to be granted that both Marcian and Pulcheria permitted the Church in the East to be subjected to a tyrannical demand of Leo.

exclude from the Council's definition. Baffled, the "lay men," who according to these Churchmen were not qualified to hear the case of Dioscorus, made a final attempt to score a victory for Leo. Their effort was based either on an unpardonable ignorance of the theology of Dioscorus, or on a deliberate determination to display a distorted version of the position of the man whom these bishops themselves had condemned. "Dioscorus has stated," they said,

> that he accepts the "of two natures," but that he does not accept the "two natures." Leo has affirmed that the two natures have been united without confusion, change and separation[1] in Christ, the Only-begotten Son, one Saviour. Whom do you follow,[2] holy Leo or Dioscorus?

---

[1] At Chalcedon, on October 8, 451, Dioscorus had stated unequivocally that the union was without confusion, mixture, change and division (See above p. 93). Therefore, on this particular issue Leo had not taught anything which Dioscorus had not affirmed. It must be stated that the comment of Sellers on this incident is not borne out by any documentary evidence. For he tries to make out that the commissioners were referring to the possibility of "confusion" lurking behind the phrase "of two natures" (*op. cit.*, p. 119). As we have seen, there is not a shred of evidence in the documents that the commissioners were moved by that fear. If they were, they would have expressed it clearly. As for the possibility of a misleading sense, neither "in two natures" nor "of two natures" was free from it. At Chalcedon, so far as we have evidence, there was no discussion of the meaning of terms or of phrases. Leo had used "in two natures." Both the Roman legates and the commissioners were anxious that it should replace "of two natures." The forcing of a term on the Church came to be interpreted later as an attempt to exclude a misleading sense which the other phrase conveyed.

[2] Kidd's comment on this point is rather bewildering. He writes: "The real choice, though the commissioners did not say so, lay between Leo and Cyril; for by Cyril's

The bishops who had been rabidly belabouring their tongues and throats for many hours were called to a halt suddenly. "As Leo, so we also believe," they shouted. "Those who oppose are Eutychians. Leo has conserved orthodoxy." The victory thus scored led to the drawing up of the Chalcedonian definition of the Faith by a Committee of bishops under the guidance of the Roman legates, Anatolius and the commissioners.[1]

---

spontaneous, as distinct from official, language Dioscorus and the Monophysites could have justified themselves" (op. cit., pp. 325-326). The first part of this statement was precisely the point of the non-Chalcedonians. They argued that Cyril and Leo could not be orthodox at the same time. Chalcedonians, on the contrary, took the opposite view, in order to make out that Leo was not an innovator. In regard to the second part of Kidd's statement, his understanding of Cyril's theology has to be challenged. In Cyril's writings there is no "official language" which accepted "two natures" and a "spontaneous language" which denied it. He had maintained that in the "One incarnate nature," we can, in contemplation, distinguish the natures of which is the One Christ. This is the non-Chalcedonian emphasis too.

[1] In trying to prove his theory that the Chalcedonian definition of the Faith has conserved all principles of value in the earlier traditions, and that it was a synthesis of all of them, Sellers does not seem to devote sufficient attention to this factual situation. The definition was drawn up in a moment of tension and hurry, and an atmosphere of that kind is not congenial for working out any synthesis. It is true that the sixth century Eastern Chalcedonians endeavoured to incorporate Cyrilline ideas into their interpretation of the Council's definition, and tried to claim Cyril as a Chalcedonian before Chalcedon. To say, on the strength of this development, that Chalcedon itself did it is an anachronism.

As we shall see in the Christology of Severus, the only theological objection to Chalcedon raised by the

On the strength of these facts, we shall try to answer the question how the Tome came to be accepted as a necessary condition of membership in the Church by the Eastern bishops who had difficulties with it till October 10, 451. In discussing this point, we must bear in mind that it was the Eastern bishops who had subscribed to the Tome and even approved the deposition of Dioscorus that presented to the assembly a draft statement, without the phrase "in two natures," for the Council's approval and fought tooth and nail to achieve their goal. This fact makes it clear that their acceptance of the Tome did not carry with it a whole-hearted adoption of the Tome's characteristic phrase. We shall not, therefore, be wrong in suggesting that they agreed to endorse the letter of Leo only to appease the bishop of Rome and pacify the emperor. The Council of Chalcedon was convened by Marcian whose right to the throne had been derived from his marrying Pulcheria, the sister of Theodosius II. Her brother had supported Dioscorus against Leo. When, however,

---

non-Chalcedonian ecclesiastical tradition was in regard to the use of the phrase "in two natures." Neither Cyril nor any Alexandrine theologian recognised by the Church had ever employed that phrase. Their phrases--"of two natures" and "one incarnate nature"--were not tantamount to denying real and perfect manhood to the Saviour, neither did they introduce "confusion." At the same time they conserved certain theological principles. Did Chalcedon which accepted the Tome of Leo and adopted the phrase "in two natures," in its day, conserve those principles? This is the question to be answered.

he died, the sister got an opportunity to reflect the spirit of enmity that had vitiated the atmosphere of the Byzantine court, and she violently reversed the religious policy of her deceased brother.[1] In an age, when the idea of a separation between the Church and the State was not a live issue, the bishops may well have thought it fitting to adopt a course of action in which lay safety for them. The imperial policy of supporting Leo against Dioscorus had, even before the Council of Chalcedon met, ensured success for Leo, and the bishop of Rome who had demanded a Council "to redress the wrongs done at Ephesus" while Theodosius II was alive, began to assume that "the Eutychian question" had been settled by his Tome, on the strength of his confidence that Pulcheria would lend him invincible support.[2] In fact, this change of imperial policy had already affected the religious loyalty of many an Eastern bishop, and the submission of Anatolius is one of the strongest cases in point. As we have already noted, he had been appointed to the see of Constantinople by the Council of 449, and had remained on the side of Dioscorus till the death of Theodosius in 450. It was only when Pulcheria came to power that he made concessions to Leo. At Chalcedon it was Anatolius that worked for the conversion of Eastern bishops to follow his example.

---

[1] It is not meant here that Theodosius II was justified in the way he had supported Dioscorus, and that Pulcheria was not in her partiality for Leo. From our point of view today, both of them were wrong. This fact has to be recognised both by Chalcedonians and non-Chalcedonians.

[2] Kidd: op. cit., p.

What we have stated thus far explains only how the Tome came to be recognised as orthodox by Eastern bishops. The more important question demanding an answer is this. How, then, was it acclaimed as a document binding on the Church? In answer to this question three points may be mentioned. (a) From the very beginning of the Council of Chalcedon the opponents of the Council of 449 proceeded on the assumption that Eutyches was a heretic. It was so much taken for granted that those who had defended him at Ephesus were led to believe the words of the powerful and state-supported party. In an age when heresy was dreaded by any Churchman as the worst enemy of salvation, these men were led to a state of panic and had no intention of even raising the specific issue that there was no documentary evidence to prove a charge of heterodoxy against the old monk. Excepting Dioscorus and the Egyptian bishops, every one at Chalcedon seems to have believed that Eutyches was a heretic. The Tome of Leo was represented as a document intended to exclude "the Eutychian heresy."[1] If we may allegorise the situation it would be something like this.

---

[1] See above p. 108.

The bishops of the East were led to accept the Tome of Leo as the only ark of safety against an imaginary dragon of a Eutychian heresy. And they approved of the condemnation of Dioscorus, because he was represented to them as the vicegerent of that fierce monster. These men, who were as far removed from clear thinking as the south pole from the north, uncritically believed that the monster was there, and they accepted the Tome as obligatory for Church membership in order to keep the Christian community free from all contamination with it.

(b) This was the way the situation was presented to them by the Roman legates and the Eastern opponents of the Council of 449. And yet a combination of these two forces may not have found it easy to secure the consent of the Eastern bishops in sympathy with the Alexandrine tradition. This may well have been the fact that led to the convening of a special gathering of a section of bishops to depose Dioscorus. This action showed the already confused Alexandrine traditionalists that their unyielding leader was at the mercy of the powerful party, and that compromise alone would save them. When once they gave their consent to what the victorious party was trying to get done, they became absolutely powerless, and from then on their only idea was to make the best out of a bad situation.

(c) The dream of these Eastern bishops was of peace and unity in the Church. They were given to understand that the emperor also wanted to remove all discord, and that without an acceptance of the Tome the Church would be divided for a long time to come. So they yielded. At the time when they accepted the Tome, Anatolius may have assured them that the Tome was being subscribed only for the sake of peace,[1] and that in regard to the definition of the Faith to be adopted by the Council, they would not go beyond their traditional phrase "of two natures."[2]

Between October 8 and 17 many things must have happened at Chalcedon, of which we have no record. We know one fact for certain. The five men condemned with Dioscorus had signed the Tome before they were rehabilitated on October 17.[3] We have no way of knowing when it actually happened. It may well be that they did it after the deposition of Dioscorus on October 13. Anatolius may have utilised the five days' recess announced by the commissioners to collect signatures from the defeated

---

[1] When the five condemned men were welcomed back into the Council, the assembly of bishops shouted: "This is perfection of unity. This is peace for the Churches" (See above p.147).

[2] That the Eastern bishops, including Anatolius and even Eusebius of Dorylaeum, fought fiercely for the draft statement with the expression "of two natures," in spite of the fact they had accepted the Tome, can be explained only by this reading.

Alexandrines, and the deposition of Dioscorus may have been calculated to ensure success for the efforts of the bishop of Constantinople.

The achievement of Chalcedon on October 17, may be summarised in this way. The Council of 449 was opposed to the Tome of Leo, and its theological basis was a party interpretation. Between the two party interpretations, there was one difference. That of the Council of 449 had assumed the existence of five authoritative documents,[1] namely the Creeds of Nicea and Constantinople, the second and third letters to Nestorius, and the letter of Cyril to John of Antioch known as the Formulary of Reunion. But the Council of Chalcedon, in accepting the Tome, definitely ignored the third letter of Cyril to Nestorius.[2] Therefore, even as a party interpretation, the Council of 449 based itself more on the earlier tradition than the Council of Chalcedon had done.

Having accepted the Tome in this way, the Council of Chalcedon drew up the Definition of the Faith, making its characteristic phrase "in two natures" central to

---

[3] In appealing for their admission to the Council, the assembled bishops had shouted: "The five who have subscribed (ὑπέγραψαν), to the Synod" (see above p. 145).

[1] Dioscorus stated at Chalcedon that he accepted five documents. See above p. 79.

[2] It was approved at Ephesus in 431. See ~~below~~ above p. 106f.

Christian orthodoxy.[1] We have seen how it was actually done. According to a tradition preserved by Zacharias of Mitylene, John, the chief of the Silentiarii, tried to persuade Dioscorus to accept the Council's Definition, but the bishop of Alexandria answered: "Sooner would Dioscorus see his hand cut off, and the blood falling on the paper, than do such a thing as that."[2] Why did Dioscorus take such a hostile stand against the Council?

In order to answer this question, two points have to be investigated. (a) The theology of Dioscorus, and (b) the Christological controversy that preceded the Home Synod of Constantinople. In the present context we shall take them up for a brief treatment.

I. THE THEOLOGY OF DIOSCORUS

Dioscorus has not left behind him much of his writing, and therefore a comprehensive reconstruction of his theology is not possible. However, we have enough of his recorded statements made both at Ephesus in 449 and at Chalcedon, as well as his literary remains, to ascertain his position relative to the controversy of his day. We have already noted most of his reported statements bearing on the dispute, and before we take up his available writings, we may try to bring out the ideas contained in the former.

---

[1] Sellers' view (above p. 82f.) that the phrase was adopted by the Council from Basil of Seleucia is not ignored here. That among Alexandrine sympathisers it was Basil who first used the phrase be true. Before he ever did it, Leo had employed it in his Tome. The role Basil played at Chalcedon does not lead us to regard him as a theologian of any standing. Therefore, Basil may have borrowed it from Leo's Tome.

[2] Zacharias of Mitylene (Eng. tr. Hamilton and Brooks, Methuen and Co., 1899), p. 44. The imperial policy was only to unify the Church on the basis of a doctrinal statement, and the tradition preserved by Zacharias need not therefore be doubted.

A. At Chalcedon he made it clear[1] that he regarded five documents, namely the Creeds of Nicea and Constantinople and three letters of Cyril, including the *Formulary of Reunion*, as authoritative.[2] This means that he accepted the doctrinal decisions of the three earlier Councils commonly regarded as ecumenical.

B. On the question of Christ's human nature, it was when Basil of Seleucia represented Eutyches as having held the notion that a simple recognition of the incarnation, without inquiring about its character, was enough, that Dioscorus expressed his dissent from a view like that.[3]

---

[1] See above p. 79.

[2] Sellers' view that Dioscorus, in his opposition to "two natures," tried to ignore the *Formulary* is not supported by any evidence. This document contained the expression "two natures." But Dioscorus objected only to "two natures after the union," which the *Formulary* did not contain.

[3] See above p. 81.

C. In regard to the phrases, he was opposed to "two natures after the union" as well as "in two natures." On the other hand, he was willing to accept "of two natures after the union."[1]

D. For him, the "of two natures" did not mean confusion, mixture, change or division.[2]

Before we attempt to bring out the meaning of these affirmations, we shall look into the literary remains of Dioscorus. We have four of his writings. Of the four, two were written to Domnus of Antioch. As the first of these two expresses grief over the consecration of Irenaeus to the see of Tyre, an act which Domnus performed in 446 or 447, it must have been written subsequent to that date. The second letter to Domnus was of a later date. These two letters were presented at the second Council of Ephesus in 449 and included in the minutes,[3] which S. G. F. Perry has translated into English from an authorised Syriac version of the sixth century. A third letter of Dioscorus written from G~~r~~angra, his place of exile, to the monks of Henaton is also preserved by Perry. The fourth is a letter to Secundinus, also written from G~~r~~angra. It is included by Zacharias of Mitylene in his Chronicles.

---

[1] See above p. 99.

[2] See above p. 93.

[3] The Council of Chalcedon read only the minutes of Ephesus concerning the rehabilitation of Eutyches and

The letters of Dioscorus to Domnus are not of great importance for understanding the former's theological position. However, they are important for obtaining the point of view of Dioscorus in the controversy between him and Domnus. Since the letters are too long to be reproduced here in full, we shall treat their contents with relevant excerpts.

Dioscorus starts his first letter to Domnus[1] by drawing a distinction between personal enmity and cleavage between persons arising out of disagreement in the Faith. In respect of the first, he says, he can conscientiously repeat with the Psalmist, "I am at peace with those who hate peace," so that, "although people should scoff at me, I refuse and fear to return their infamy and scoffing." And he continues,

> Yea, even when they show an audacious inclination to strike me and, by act, give proof of their intention, it is not mine to punish (for such acts); they must all be borne with, and no great attention ought to be paid to them.[2]

---

the deposition of Flavian and Eusebius. For the rest of the Council's minutes we have to depend on Perry's work, as Mansi does not include it.

[1] S. G. F. Perry, The Second Synod of Ephesus, pp. 327-338.

[2] That this statement of Dioscorus about himself is not altogether devoid of truth may be observed by comparing his writings from the place of his exile with the work of Nestorius from that of his. In neither of the two

> But on the subject of the Faith, if any one disagrees with us, he is trying to nullify that which is common to us all. We affirm, for instance, that "Christ is the Only-begotten Son of God and the First-begotten, in whom and by whom are all things, who, for our sakes, became incarnate and who has, in no respect whatever, undergone (even) the shadow of change."

With this introduction, he proceeds to describe the purpose of his correspondence. He has received reports, he says, about some people in Antioch, who, after having given their assent to the Holy and ecumenical Council of Nicea as well as to its Sister, namely that of Ephesus, and after having abandoned the heretic Nestorius and his teaching, are now spreading his views in the Church.[1] He makes special mention of Theodoret who, according to reports,

---

letters that have come down to us, there is a single mention of his enemies, or of their plot against him. Nestorius, on the contrary, in his Bazaar of Heracleides, is still an accuser of his opponents.

The way he closes his second letter to Domnus proves that, even in the tempestuous atmosphere of the Church of his day, Dioscorus had some amount of genuine trust in God's unfailing providence. "Nevertheless," he writes, "we ought to reflect that our Redeemer is competent to allay all the commotion; for, in Him we live and move and have our being."

[1] Granting that both Cyril and Dioscorus were unfair to Nestorius, the fact is that Chalcedon was in no way juster to him than they. For Dioscorus, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Diodore of Tarsus, Theodoret of Cyrus, Ibas of Edessa and the men who belonged to their way of thinking were of the same theological position as Nestorius. But for Leo and the Council of Chalcedon, Nestorius stood alone. We shall not be totally incorrect in saying that, whereas

had asserted in the presence of Domnus that "he was not dividing Immanuel by affirming that the mere Man only was palpable to (touched by) Thomas, and that God only was worshipped (by him)." On the contrary, argues Dioscorus, this view is based on a division of Christ into two. Christ is one, and any attempt to divide Him is opposed to the Scriptures.

In this context Dioscorus makes mention of the Formulary of Reunion. "John of blessed memory, who was the bishop previously to your Piety (was consentient) and concurred with us completely" in regard to the indivisibility of the one Christ. It is that agreement which is now being called in question. The writer now proceeds. "But once more I turn to you, O God-loving Priest of Antioch and my Brother! and (I pray) you for his sake who never ceased from supporting that concord of the Church common to us and you, which he rendered powerless for man to dissever."[1]

Dioscorus lacked in appreciation of the teaching of Nestorius and his school, Leo and the Council lacked in both understanding and appreciation.

[1] This statement referring to John of Antioch is a clear proof that Sellers is wrong in his understanding of facts concerning the dispute. For, according to him, Dioscorus was trying to ignore the Formulary. (See below p. 172. . Sellers, op. cit., pp. 77-78, 81). The point of Dioscorus' is that it was Domnus who was letting the peace based on the Formulary be nullified.

Having praised John of Antioch, the writer goes on to pay the most glorious tribute possible to Cyril. He protests against the treatises composed by Antiochenes in opposition to the writings of "our Blessed and Famous Father and Bishop, Cyril." Those who have done this, says Dioscorus, are "disturbers (of concord) and highly reprehensible in speaking against a time of peace, not knowing how great a boon it is to live in peace."

Before introducing the delicate question of Irenaeus, a digamist,[1] whom Domnus had raised to episcopate, his qualification being that he was a friend of Nestorius and had opposed the *Formulary of Reunion*, Dioscorus writes:

> Besides, however, the above mentioned circumstances, there is this one, which has occasioned grief to us and to the Egyptian Synod--for it is only right and just that, when I write to your Holiness, I should, with a frankness and a love befitting Brothers, make known all matters to you openly and without reserve, particularly those that make for the service of and are of utility to the fair name of the community as well as to the spiritual flock of Christ.

After treating the subject of Irenaeus, Dioscorus writes:

> I therefore pray your Piety, who are not, I think, devoid of that wisdom which yields to the kind request of Brethren, to rise up now and stop every mouth that utters iniquity against God.[2]

---

[1] According to Theodoret, as Sellers points out, "the clergy of Constantinople had been threatening to take action against this digamist and Nestorian" (*op. cit.*, P. 42, n.2).

[2] This is the correspondence of Dioscorus to Domnus which Sellers takes as an indication that the

The reply of Domnus to this letter[1] did not answer any of the points raised by Dioscorus, which led the latter to write a second letter.[2] He writes the letter, says Dioscorus, in the spirit of Paul who exclaimed

> Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? Shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword? "As it is written, For Thy sake are we killed all the day long."

He then goes on to explain the purpose of his correspondence, namely

> to urge your Piety to restrain certain teachers with you. . .who magnify themselves, presuming that they can speak well, and consequently entertain very high opinion of themselves.

In this context Dioscorus refers to persons in the company of Domnus who were condemning the Council of Ephesus. Such men, says Dioscorus, go over to Egypt and spread their notions in the monasteries, and are thereby causing disturbance in his province also.

It is in reply to this letter, that Domnus made mention of Cyril's Twelve anathematisms. Domnus writes,

---

former endeavoured to dominate the see of Antioch (op. cit., pp. 33, 42-43). The two sentences which we have quoted do not imply in the least that Dioscorus had any idea of dominating another see. On the contrary, he wrote to Domnus protesting against an Antiochene violation of the Concordat of 433.

[2] Perry, op. cit., pp. 339-343.

[3] Ibid., pp. 344-351. The letter of Domnus which we have is not complete, and that may partly explain why no answer is found in it.

> For, when we[1] learnt from him who is of Blessed Memory, (viz.) Paul of Emesa, that the twelve chapters were acceptable to the Easterns, he abstained making any mention of any one of these letters addressed to the Blessed John, but concurring in those explanations (prohibitions), transmitted thence, in relation to the Incarnation of our Redeemer, he indited the assenting reply, and eradicated hostility and restored peace to the Holy Churches of God throughout the world.

Domnus then goes on to say that if the twelve anathematisms are mentioned, there will be so much of confusion in the East that the clergy and laity will even shun his communion.

The argument of Domnus is that Cyril, when once he learned about the Antiochenes that they were willing to accept the twelve anathematisms, stopped mentioning them as a condition for union, because he knew that it had created problems in the minds of the Antiochenes. As this document is important for an understanding of the controversy, it will engage our attention a little later. However, the fact is that, in neither of his letters to Domnus had Dioscorus even made a reference to this document. In other words, we have no evidence that, in regard to this document, Dioscorus went any further than Cyril. On the other hand, his remonstrances were against the way things were being done by the Antiochenes.

---

[1] The "we" here does not make any sense. And we, therefore, propose that it was due to an error of the copyist, and that it should be "he" referring to Cyril.

The letter of Dioscorus to the monks of Henaton is more theological in character than his letters to Domnus. We shall reproduce from it the passages bearing on the theological position of Dioscorus.[1]

> I am fully aware, having been educated in the Faith, respecting Him (Christ) that He was born of the Father, as God, and that the Same was born of Mary, as man. Men saw Him as man walking on the earth and they saw Him, the Creator of the heavenly hosts, as God. They saw Him sleeping in the ship, as man, and they saw Him walking upon the waters, as God. They saw Him hungry as man, and they saw Him feeding (others) as God. They saw Him thirsty as man, and they saw Him giving drink as God. They saw Him stoned by the Jews as man, and they saw Him tempted as man, and they saw Him drive away the devils as God. And similarly of many (other) things.[2]
>
> But we leave the absurdity of those who hold opposite notions, and we confess one and the same to be the Redeemer, the Lord and God, although we see Him to have become by economy man. Hold to the confession, therefore, of the fathers and do not listen to the soul-destroying words of heretics, nor hold intercourse with those who divide into two Him who is one; for one is our Redeemer, as I said, although out of compassion for us He became man.
>
> Sufficiently indeed, as I consider, to the great confusion of Heretics, the teachings of

---

[1] For the letter, see Perry, op. cit., pp. 392-394.

[2] Sellers quotes this passage and comments that it may have been an adaptation of the Tome of Leo (op. cit., p. 32). This way of expressing the mystery of the Incarnation is very common in the Syrian Forms of Worship for Christmas, Epiphany, Lent, Palm Sunday and Holy Week. To say that all this is an adaptation of the Tome is presumptuous. It goes back, as we may venture to suggest, to the theological development from Ignatius of Antioch.

> Holy Bishops and Orthodox Archbishops have proved the fatuity of the Affirmations of Heretics and shown at the same time that it is an Impiety to speak of two natures in God the Word Incarnate; for, they have excommunicated those who hold this Doctrine, and they have banished from The Hope of Christians those who do not confess God the Word to be Consubstantial with the Father, because He became Consubstantial with Man, taking Flesh, although He remained unchangeably what He was before; as they had done (excommunicated and banished) with the rest of the Heretics.

In this letter we find four ideas uncompromisingly affirmed. (a) Jesus Christ is the eternal Son of God, Himself Very God, in His incarnate state. (b) He is consubstantial both with His Father and with us. (c) This two-foldness does not involve a division of the one Lord into two natures. (d) Though, as God, He is beyond every change, in His incarnate state, He underwent all human experiences as any other man. Both glory and weakness apply to the same person and to the same incarnate nature.

The letter of Dioscorus to Secundinus is very outspoken in its rejection of notions ascribed to Eutyches.[1]

> Omitting many urgent matters, this I declare, that no man shall say that the holy flesh, which our Lord took from the Virgin Mary, by the operation of the Holy Spirit, in a manner which He Himself knows, was different to, or foreign from, our body. And, indeed, since this is so, they who affirm that Christ did not become incarnate for us, give the lie to Paul. For he has said, "Not from angels did He take (the nature), but from the seed of the House of

---

[1] Zacharias Mitylene, op. cit., pp. 45-46.

Abraham;" to which seed Mary was no stranger, as the Scriptures teach us. And again, "It was right that in everything He should be like unto His brethren," and that word "in everything" does not suffer the subtraction of any part of our nature: since in nerves, and hair, and bones, and veins, and belly, and heart, and kidneys, and liver, and lungs, and in short, in all those things that belong to our nature, the flesh which was born from Mary was compacted with the soul of our Redeemer,[1] that reasonable and intelligent soul, without the seed of man, and the gratification and cohabitation of sleep.

For if, as the heretics think, this was not so, how is He named our brother, supposing that He used a body different from ours? And how, again, is that true which He said to His Father, "I will declare Thy name to my brethren?" Let us not reject, neither let us despise, those who think in this way. For He was like us, for us, and with us, not in phantasy, nor in mere semblance, according to the heresy of the Manichaeans, but rather in actual reality from

---

[1] The passage as it is found in Hamilton and Brooks' translation of Zacharias is misleading. For it affirms only that Christ's flesh was born of Mary, and that the flesh was compacted with a reasonable and intelligent soul. In Michael the Syrian's version of Zacharias the passage reads in this way: ܒܟܠܗܘܢ ܕܝܠܝܢ ܠܟܝܢܢ
ܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܒܣܪܐ ܡܢܦܫܐ ܕܦܪܘܩܢ ܕܐܬܝܠܕ ܡܢ ܡܪܝܡ
ܒܢܦܫܐ ܡܠܝܠܬܐ ܘܡܣܬܟܠܢܝܬܐ ܗܘܐ ܡܢ ܙܪܥܐ ܕܓܒܪܐ.
(Michael le Syrien, IV, p. 202) It means:

In all the things that are proper to our nature our Redeemer's animated flesh, which was born of Mary, with a rational and intelligent soul, came into being without the seed of Man. . .

Therefore, the idea which Dioscorus affirms is not merely that the flesh of Christ was born from Mary, but that His soul-possessing flesh was assumed from Her. In other words, it was perfect manhood that Christ received from Mary.

> Mary, the Theotokos. To comfort the desolate and to repair the vessel that had been broken, He came to us new. And as Immanuel, indeed, He is confessed; for He became poor for us, according to the saying of Paul, "that we, by His humiliation, might be made rich." He became, by the dispensation, like us; that we, by His tender mercy, might be like Him. He became man, and yet He did not destroy that which is His nature, that He is Son of God; that we, by grace, might become sons of God. This I think and believe; and, if any man does not think thus, he is a stranger to the faith of the apostles.

In trying to read heresy into Eutyches, Eusebius of Dorylaeum had asserted at Chalcedon that the monk had not specified where the body of Christ was from.[1] On this point Dioscorus had expressed his disagreement at Chalcedon itself. In this letter he makes clear his position in regard to that issue. Therefore, the only way for Chalcedon to challenge Dioscorus is that he did not accept the phrase "in two natures." On the other hand, he was satisfied with the phrase "of two natures." What, then, must that phrase have meant to him?

As we have seen, for Dioscorus, there was a union of two natures in Christ. It was a union of the divine nature of the Son of God with a human nature consubstantial with ours derived from Mary. In the union there was no confusion or mixture of the natures; neither was either nature changed over into the other, nor was one nature divided from the other. Dioscorus maintained that Christ was like us in everything pertaining to our nature, and that He referred to us as His brethren.

---

[1] See above p. 80.

What, then, is the resulting Christology? Dioscorus has not stated it in clear terms. In the light of his affirmations, we may venture to put it in this way.

The Person of Jesus Christ was the Person of the Son of God in His incarnate state. In the incarnation there was a concurrence of the divine nature of the Son with a human nature. This happened at the very moment when the Virgin conceived Him in her womb, so that the divine and the human natures came together into a focal point as it were, and the entire life of Christ ever since was a continuation of that focal point. Neither in the union nor after it was there confusion, mixture, change or division of the natures. Therefore, the natures were real even after the union.

In regard to the operation of the natures, Dioscorus must have taken the body-soul analogy of Cyril very seriously. The body in man, for instance, is real, and so is the soul. There happened a union of the two, and, at every moment of a man's life, the entire behaviour of his person proceeds from that union. We can make a distinction in our minds and say that some actions are of the body, some of the soul, and some others of a union of the two. We shall see later that Severus of Antioch made this emphasis central to his Christology. The affirmations of Dioscorus can make sense only if we take them to have sprung from such an emphasis. If this is what he actually meant, he was a loyal disciple of Cyril of Alexandria.

The Person of Christ was, therefore, the Person of the one (united)[1] incarnate nature of God the Word. In the incarnation the divine nature concurred with a human nature, namely a body-soul entity, born of the Virgin. Every action of Christ was of His one Person, and it proceeded from the union of the natures. In the union the human nature was made His own by God the Son. Therefore, Christ's hunger, though it had all the qualities of our hunger, since it was made His very own by God, was not merely human hunger. So were His miracles. They were works of God, but when Christ did them, they proceeded from a state of union of Godhead with manhood.

The Tome of Leo affirmed the personal unity of Christ, and we have in it statements like, "properties of both natures and substances were preserved and co-existed in one Person," "One Person of God and man," and one Person suffering in the human nature. However, in regard to the natures, Leo affirmed that each nature performed what was its own, and that what each nature performed was applicable to both. The connection between personal unity and two operating natures is hard to find in Leo's theology. If we take his emphasis on the operation of the natures seriously, the function of the one Person was to harmonise the operations. If that is what he meant, his idea was in no way different from what history has known as Nestorianism. It is, therefore, not surprising that Dioscorus and his successors regarded Leo as a Nestorian.

---

[1] The word μία which the Alexandrines used means "(united) one;" it should be distinguished from μόνος which means "single." See below pp. 410f.

The significance of the Christology of Dioscorus which we tried to state on the strength of his affirmations cannot be ignored. Though we can agree that the phrase "in two natures" can also comprehend it, the fact is that it was not made clear at Chalcedon. As we have seen, there was no theological discussion at Chalcedon on the basis of principles. A child of his age, Dioscorus was subject to its limitations. He misunderstood the phrase "in two natures" as much as Leo and the Antiochenes misconstrued "one incarnate nature." In order to get an idea of the misunderstanding that existed between the two parties in the East, we may survey briefly the Christological controversy prior to the Home Synod of Constantinople in 448.

II. THE CHRISTOLOGICAL CONTROVERSY PRIOR TO 448

The conflict between Nestorius and Cyril had arisen as a result of the former's decision to call in question the applicability of the title Theotokos to the Virgin.[1] Behind this there lay a theological emphasis which was Antiochene. Cyril wrote two letters, trying to convince Nestorius that his criticism of the term Theotokos had theological implications of an unsound nature. However, Nestorius refused to be convinced, and began to criticise the teaching of Cyril as falling into error. It was in this situation that Cyril convened the Egyptian Synod and drew up his third letter with twelve articles (anathematisms) for Nestorius to accept, in default of which it was made clear that he would be excommunicated. Nestorius not only rejected the anathematisms, but offered twelve counter-anathematisms.

---

[1] According to Loofs, "More than the heretic Nestorius, the 'Saint' but really unsaintly Cyril is to be held responsible for the Nestorian controversy" (Nestorius, p. 41). However, the evidences which he cites to substantiate the statement prove only that both Cyril and Nestorius had personal grievances against each other (Ibid., pp. 30-40). Loofs grants that Leo's Tome and the Chalcedonian Formula did not accord entirely with the Cyrilline tradition, that even on the Chalcedonian norm Nestorius can be regarded as orthodox only if it is taken in an Antiochene or a Western sense, and that later orthodoxy came to be fixed in neither of these, but in the Cyrilline tradition (Ibid., pp. 99-107). However, we must remember that theological misunderstanding of each other existed with both men. The crux of the problem lay in Nestorius' criticism of the term Theotokos. When once this term was granted by the Antiochenes, Cyril was willing to accept as orthodox a statement of the Faith with the phrase "two natures." That the two men did not understand each other was unfortunate. At the same time, the fact that, at the beginning of the conflict, Nestorius had the support of the emperor, and that in all probability he had hoped to get Cyril condemned by the Council of 431, does not exonerate Nestorius.

This was the background of the Council of Ephesus in 431. The Council condemned Nestorius as a heretic, and the theological basis of that action was Alexandrine orthodoxy as expressed in the letters of Cyril. It resulted in the alienation between the Antiochenes and the rest of Christendom. The emperor,[1] with whom Nestorius had been in the best of relations, ordered his exile, and John of Antioch assumed the leadership of the Antiochene party. The efforts of the emperor to reunite the two parties were crowned with success when in 433 John and Cyril agreed to a concordat. As this was an important event in the controversy we have to look into the terms on which it was concluded.

The Antiochene objections were mainly three. (a) Cyril's twelve anathematisms were heretical. (b) The condemnation of Nestorius was illegal. (c) The Council of Ephesus which accepted the first and decided upon the second was, therefore, a heretical gathering. Of these three objections, the second and the third were expressly withdrawn by the Antiochenes. This means that they agreed to the condemnation of Nestorius and the recognition of the Council of 431 as authoritative.[1] Regarding the first, the Antiochenes tried in all possible ways to get Cyril to withdraw the anathematisms. The only answer of Cyril was to explain them and show that no heresy was implied in them. His explanation satisfied John and the moderate Antiochenes, and they agreed to condemn Nestorius and accept the Council of Ephesus. The very fact that they agreed to both these implies that they had no objection to be pressed against the anathematisms.

---

[1] Emperor Theodosius II was a whole-hearted supporter of Nestorius in the beginning. It was with much difficulty

---

he could be convinced of Cyril's orthodoxy. From the time he came to believe it, he continued to oppose the Antiochenes, and the second Council of Ephesus was the crowning work of his religious policy. It was as much his Council as Chalcedon was his sister's.

[1] Judged from the point of view of official acceptance by the Church, Loofs' view that "a Council of Ephesus, an ecumenical Council of Ephesus, never existed" (*op. cit.*, p. 53) is true only of the period between 431 and 433. Since, as Nestorian studies of our times have shown, the point of view of the condemned man was misrepresented at the Council of 431, and what is known to history as "Nestorianism" had never been held by Nestorius, we can say that the Cyrilline party which opposed him and the Antiochene party which abandoned him were equally wrong. Looked at from this point of view, we can admit that the Church of our times need not be bound by the decision of the Council of 431 in regard to the person of Nestorius. However, the fact still remains that Christian history has condemned Nestorius as a heretic and that its basis was Alexandrine orthodoxy.

In this context a word about this document is necessary. The Council of 431 had read the second letter of Cyril to Nestorius. It was approved by the assembly by acclamation.[1] Then was read the reply of Nestorius which was rejected with anathemas. This was followed by the reading of Coelestine's letter to Nestorius and Cyril's third letter with the anathematisms. Both of them were accepted by the assembly as orthodox. The next point which the Council adopted in evidence against Nestorius was the deposition of the men who had taken the third letter of Cyril to the bishop of Constantinople. These facts are enough to make clear that no one at the Council of 431 had doubted that the third letter of Cyril was authoritative. The Council itself was controlled by men of the Alexandrine way of thinking. It is impossible that they did not accept it formally. The Alexandrines ever since came to regard it as a document of the Faith. One of the weightiest objections to the Council raised by the Antiochenes in 431 was that it accepted the twelve anathematisms of Cyril. So, in their petition addressed by their counter Council to the emperor, they attacked the Council on that ground.[2] In his celebrated letter to Maris, Ibas of Edessa says that the Council of Cyril "adopted, and confirmed and assented to, the Twelve Chapters written by Cyril" in its "act of deposition" against Nestorius.[1] In the face of such bitter opposition to the Council on this ground, if this were not fact, at least one of the bishops who had been present at the Council of 431 would have made it clear that that was not the case. On the other hand, in spite of opposition from the Antiochene side, the Alexandrines including Cyril continued to hold to it as a document of the Faith.

---

[1] Kidd, op. cit., p. 242.

[2] Hefele, op. cit., p. 93.

The concordat of 433 was based on a mutual recognition of orthodoxy by Cyril and John. Though Cyril made it clear that he would not withdraw any of his writings,[2] he did not insist on an open acceptance of any one of them by the Antiochenes as a condition of reunion. The Antioochenes, on their part, did not go beyond that either. Thus there was no express acceptance of the Anathematisms from the Antiochenes, but they were satisfied with Cyril's theology. As a basis of reunion, John sent Cyril a statement of the Faith, with which the latter was satisfied. Thereupon he wrote back to John his famous letter known as the Formulary of Reunion, expressing his approval of the statement sent him. Cyril quoted John's statement, which contained these words.

---

[1] Perry, op. cit., p. 115. [2] See below p. 186.

> And with regard to the evangelic and apostolic sayings concerning the Lord, we know that theologians make some common, as relating to one Person (πρόσωπου), and distinguish others, as relating to two natures, interpreting the God-befitting ones of the Godhead of Christ and the lowly ones of His Humanity.[1]

This statement, though an Alexandrine would not have put the idea in this way, was not really opposed to his tradition. For it affirmed that we can distinguish the sayings and actions of Christ, some as belonging to the one Person, some others to the divine nature, and some others to the human nature. In other words, John tried to safeguard the Antiochene emphasis that in Christ God and man were not confused one with the other. This emphasis was not opposed to the Alexandrine tradition, and Cyril readily approved it as orthodox. However, the phrase "two natures" and the ascribing of words and deeds to each nature were not consistent with the tradition of the Alexandrines, and Cyril's friends and associates questioned him on that point. His answer to them is important for understanding the nature of the concordat itself from his point of view. It brings out the following facts.

---

[1] Mansi VI 669. For the English translation, see T. H. Bindley, The Oecumenical Documents of the Faith, p. 221.

(a) In agreeing to the concordat, Cyril's concern was for the peace of the Church.[1] The emperor wanted unity, and, in order to achieve the goal, compromise was indispensable. And yet Cyril made it only on condition that the Antiochenes would accept the theological emphasis dear to his heart.

(b) Cyril wrote to Valerian of Iconium that the Orientals condemned Nestorius, confessed the Virgin to be *Theotokos*, without adding *Christotokos* or *anthropotokos*, and affirmed that Christ was one, the Same being at once God and man.[2]

(c) The Antiochenes tried hard to make Cyril retract what he had written earlier in the controversy, obviously aiming at the exclusion of his third letter to Nestorius. On that point Cyril made no concession, but he made it clear that his writings were intended to keep out "the foul teaching of Nestorius."[3]

---

[1] This point is clearly stated by Cyril, in his letter to Aeacius of Melitene (PG, LXXVII, p. 184).

[2] PG, LXXVII, pp. 276-277. The point of Cyril is this. In criticising the term *Theotokos*, Nestorius must have assumed that the Logos and the Son of the Virgin were two persons. So he could speak of her as *Christotokos* or *anthropotokos*. The Antiochenes rejected that position and agreed to affirm that the Virgin was *Theotokos*.

[3] See Cyril's letter to Acacius, PG, LXXVII, pp. 184-185.

(d) The acceptance of the Council of Ephesus by the Antiochenes and their condemnation of Nestorius were unconditional.[1]

(e) Therefore, the phrase "two natures" is innocuous. It means only that the natures of which is the one Christ are two, and that in the union there is no absorption of one in the other, nor is there any confusion or mixture between them. It did not mean a separation of the natures as Nestorius was understood to affirm. In any case, Cyril did not use the phrase "two natures;" it was used by John.[2] The one phrase he repeatedly employs in these correspondences is "one incarnate nature of God the Word."

About the reunion itself it must be remembered that it was more a political move than the result of a desire for union of hearts and minds. Naturally it was opposed by convinced men on either side, with whom considerations of expediency did not weigh. However, Cyril and John continued to be loyal in adhering to it.

The reunion was a golden opportunity for both sides to work for a deeper understanding of each by the other and a theological synthesis. Neither side, however, was interested in that. To be fair to the ancients, we may say that the fact of a difference in intellectual presuppositions between the two sides and the need for a synthesis were not even felt by them. For them, the Faith was one; it had to be expressed in conformity with the Scriptures and the tradition of the Church. From this point of view, the Alexandrine position was unassailable; for it could adduce Church fathers like Athanasius and the Cappadocians in its support. These men had long ago received recognition by the entire Church as doctors of unpolluted orthodoxy. The Antiochenes, on the other hand, had in men like Theodore of Mopsuestia and Diodore of Tarsus very able teachers; but these men had received no recognition outside the Antiochene circles. However, the influence they wielded in the Orient was great. The peace of 433 was tantamount to unseating them from their throne of glory, and their disciples were not willing to acquiesce in the situation. Though John managed to deprive of their sees outspoken critics of the concordat on his side, there were men among his associates who would weep over the blow they sustained. The episcopates of John and Cyril thus came to be a period of external quiet concealing deep unrest.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 185

[2] PG, LXXVII, p. 200.

The men of the Antiochene way of thinking could be divided into three broad groups. (a) Those who honestly desired peace in the Church and were ready to make concessions wherever they were convinced that no principle was sacrificed. John of Antioch, most certainly, belonged to this group. (b) Extremists who would not have anything to do with Cyril, the opponent of Nestorius, their hero. Theodoret of Cyrus belonged to this group at first. (c) The shrewd diplomatists who agreed to the concordat for the sake of expediency, but were determined to oppose the Alexandrines, and make all their assertions gradually. Theodoret changed from the second group and assumed the intellectual leadership of this group. When once John got the extremists out of the way, the third group could gain control of the Antiochene party. An able controversialist, Theodoret could misrepresent the Alexandrine point of view in the interests of the Antiochene, and thereby make himself obnoxious in the eyes of the upholders of the former.[1] As our illustration of the way the Antiochenes were trying to assert their point of view, we can refer to their publication of the works of Theodore of Mopsuestia. Alexandrines who were watching the movements of the Antiochenes came out to oppose the attempt, and Cyril wrote to John, asking him to stop it. John, however, answered defending Theodore. In order to keep the unity of the Church, Cyril instructed his partisans to follow a course of moderation. At the same time, he expressed his disapproval of the way things were being done, by publishing a treatise against Theodore and Diodore. The Antiochene reply to this came from the pen of Theodoret in the form of an Apology for these men.[1]

---

[1] The fact that Cyril himself asked John to reprimand Theodoret is to be noted. (Sellers, op. cit., p. 25.)

The diplomatists of the Antiochene party thus carried forward their programme of action without creating any hitch with John. Having changed from the group of the extremists and accepted the Formulary, Theodoret worked in cooperation with John till his death in 442. Already the author of several polemical writings against Cyril and the Alexandrine theological position, Theodoret had been held to be a full-fledged "Nestorian" by the men of the Cyrilline party.[2]

---

[1] Sellers, op. cit., pp. 27-28. Theodore was highly venerated by the Antiochenes as Lucian of Antioch had been by the Eastern conservatives in the Nicene days. The Christology of the Antiochene school may be regarded as having been ably developed and bequeathed to his disciples by Theodore. The second Council of Constantinople in 553 condemned him as a heretic long after his death.

[2] For Sellers' treatment of the way John had dealt with the extremists of his party, see op. cit., pp. 22-24.

As we have noted, Theodoret accepted the Formulary and was reconciled to John after some hesitation. This change implies that he condemned Nestorius and accepted the Council of Ephesus. However, even as late as 446 or 447 he criticised the theology of Cyril to the great annoyance of the Alexandrines. We have seen how the commissioners tried at the beginning of the Council of Chalcedon to have him participate as a full member of the Council, ignoring his deposition by the Council of 449. It was on October 26

In 442 John of Antioch was succeeded by Domnus. Very dependent on Theodoret, he was only a name. Having been acclaimed as the theological master of the bishop of Antioch, Theodoret guided Domnus to carry on an unscrupulous warfare on Alexandrine sympathisers within the jurisdiction of the Syrian see.[1] Its nature may be

---

that Chalcedon declared him orthodox. The way this was done may be noted in Mansi VII 185-194.

When his case was taken up, he tried to make a statement. But the bishops did not let him do it. Instead, they required of him to anathematise Nestorius. This demand reflects the lack of clear thinking characteristic of the Council. However, in response to the demand, he said: "By the grace of God I have been brought up among the orthodox, and I have taught orthodoxy, and the orthodox Faith I have preached. I turn away not only from Nestorius and Eutyches, but also from every man who does not hold the correct Faith, and I regard him as a stranger." The bishops now interrupted and demanded an unequivocal anathema on Nestorius and his friends. Again he began to indulge in an expatiation on his own orthodoxy. A third time the bishops asked him to do what was required of him. This time he anathematised Nestorius.

Obviously Theodoret was not convinced of having held any heretical view at any time in his life. In that case, why did he change his mind about supporting Nestorius? Why did he accept the _Formulary of Reunion_? Having done both these, why did he hesitate to show at least a gentleman's appreciation of Cyril and his theology?

We are not arguing here that Theodoret and the other Antiochenes should have given up their theological conviction. Our point is only to show that these men, in accepting the concordat of 433 and condemning Nestorius, were led by consideration of expediency, and that the Council of Chalcedon, in condemning Nestorius and recognising these men, showed that there was no clear thinking in the assembly.

[1] Sellers, _op. cit._, pp. 34-36.

imagined from the way Athanasius of Perrah was treated by a Synod of Antioch.[1] The charge against him was that he had taken to himself some silver pillars. The accusation was made, and immediately a Synod was convened, which deposed Athanasius. At the same time, more serious charges were made against Ibas of Edessa, an Antiochene in theology, but Domnus turned a deaf ear to all of them.[2]

The fact, therefore, is that Dioscorus succeeded Cyril in 444, at a time when the Antiochenes were not only bent on discrediting the theological point of view which he believed was exclusively orthodox, but had also been ill treating men, who, in his judgment, were upholding it. In that situation it was only natural for Dioscorus to fight for the cause of what he regarded as the uncorrupt Faith of the Church. It was, in his view, the see of Antioch which was making it difficult for orthodoxy to grow in the Church. His action was in no way more undesirable than that of the Antiochenes, nor was it an attempt to dominate the Syrian see.[3]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 35, n.

[2] Against Ibas there were both doctrinal and criminal charges. The doctrinal charges were the primary basis of his condemnation by the Council of 449. Chalcedon ignored them. Finally, the second Council of Constantinople in 553 confirmed the decision of 449 both in his case and in that of Theodoret. The criminal charges against Ibas were embezzlement of Church money and perjury (Perry, op. cit., pp. 128-130).

[3] Sellers says that the Christological controversy

So the conflict was between the Nestorian party that cast out their hero for the sake of expediency, and the Cyrilline party. Theodoret was practically the leader of the former and Dioscorus that of the latter. From 444 to 450, till the death of emperor Theodosius II, Dioscorus enjoyed the favour of the court, and he used it to put down every effort of the Antiochene party to gain the upper hand in the conflict.

Eutyches, the old archimandrite, was an indefatigable supporter of the Alexandrine cause at the capital. A friend of Cyril, he was honoured by men of that way of thinking. In Constantinople itself he enjoyed great esteem at the court and large sections of people venerated him as a man of piety. He was condemned as a heretic by Home Synod of Constantinople in 448 on the ground that he would not accept the Antiochene phrase "two natures after the Union" and anathematise those who raised objection to

---

was used both by Cyril and by Dioscorus to dominate first the see of Constantinople and then that of Antioch (op. cit., p. 33). As we have already noted, there were theological as well as non-theological factors connected with the controversy. This was true of both parties. Sellers is too quick to believe even the gossip spread against the Alexandrines by their enemies. He refers, for instance, to a statement of Theodoret in a letter to the effect that Dioscorus "bought his destruction for large sums of money" (Ibid., p. 34, n.), In the case of Ibas of Edessa this was a charge against him at the Council of 449. (Perry, op. cit., p. 99.), but Sellers ignores it. A charge against a person made at a Council is of more weight than a statement in a private letter. In the case of Dioscorus, Theodoret's testimony has to be doubted.

it. When a friend was thus treated, simply because he happened to be on the Alexandrine side, it was very natural for Dioscorus and the Council of 449 to defend him.

Flavian of Constantinople was not a trouble-maker on the Antiochene side. In fact, the confession of Faith which he presented to the emperor did not contain anything which, in the light of his admissions, Dioscorus would have opposed.[1] But the point on which the Council of 449 was constrained to take action against him was the decision of the Home Synod against Eutyches, the theological basis of which, as we have seen, was exclusively Antiochene. As it did not leave any room for the Alexandrine way of thinking even to exist in the Church, it was strictly a party decision.[2] Flavian informed Leo of Rome and Domnus of Antioch about the decision against Eutyches. But we have no evidence that he informed Dioscorus also of it. If he did not, Flavian identified himself with the Antiochene party and entered the lists against the Alexandrines.

---

[1] In his own statement both at Constantinople in 448 and in his Confession presented to the emperor he employed only ἐκ δύο φύσεων (Sellers, *op. cit.*, pp. 130-131).

[2] Sellers has shown that Flavian remained loyal to the *Formulary of Reunion*. But he does not pause to think what the basis of the Home Synod's decision was. As we have shown, it was that "two natures after the union" alone was orthodox, and that Eutyches should anathematise every one who would not accept it. This, certainly, had not been granted by the *Formulary of Reunion*.

On the strength of the facts we have brought out, the following conclusions may be drawn in regard to the Council of Chalcedon.

1. The Council was a victory of the Antiochene party, for which its leaders had been fighting for two decades.

2. They achieved this victory through Leo of Rome. The bishop of Rome had no real understanding of the Eastern Christological thinking, or of the nature of the controversy that had nearly split up the Church in the East. The fact that he had his own theological conviction need not be called in question. However, his point was more to assert his claim of supremacy for his see over the universal Church than to be fair to the parties in the conflict. We shall not be wrong in saying that Leo availed himself of an Eastern theological controversy and the political favour which he enjoyed to acclaim the bishop of Rome as the "Head of all Churches."

3. The concordat of 433 had opened up the way for working out a synthesis between the two rival ways of thinking in the East. This was spoiled by both sides. The decision of the Home Synod of Constantinople in 448 in the case of Eutyches went beyond the basis of the concordat and declared the Antiochene position as exclusively orthodox. Therefore, it was one-sided. The decision of the

Council of 449 was its antithesis. The Council of Chalcedon confirmed the decision of the Home Synod; it did not work out any synthesis.

4. At the Council of Chalcedon the Alexandrines had voice only insofar as they were willing to agree with the party decision of 448 and the Tome of Leo. There was no theological discussion at the Council, in which the Alexandrine emphasis was even sharply stated.

5. The fact that all the bishops present, except Dioscorus, signed the Tome of Leo and the Council's Definitio does not make them really ecumenical documents of the Church, because, in its day, the Council had not comprehended a theological emphasis which lay behind the protest of Dioscorus and which was central to the Alexandrine tradition.

6. Therefore, the existence in the Church of an Alexandrine way of thinking was perfectly justifiable. The fact that the sixth-century Chalcedonians in the East became confirmed in that tradition was itself because the non-Chalcedonian branch of the Church was a force to be reckoned with. Since it was a Chalcedonian attempt, ignoring the fact of a division of the Church, even that cannot be regarded as a real synthesis.

Chapter Four

The Split in the Eastern Church

The leaders of the Council of Chalcedon succeeded in making out that the Council's Definition of the Faith was the unanimous decision of the Church. The emperor felt gratified that, in his day, the Church became united. One point, however, was ignored: those who signed the Formula were bishops; they could be challenged by their congregations as well as by bishops who had not participated in the Council. This is precisely what happened. In many places in the East there were bishops, clergy, monks and congregations to carry forward the protest expressed by Dioscorus at Chalcedon. Notwithstanding all imperial efforts to quell them, they continued in their dissent.

The first storm of reaction was raised in Jerusalem immediately after the Council. As we have seen, Juvenal of Jerusalem had been one of the co-presidents with Dioscorus at the Council of 449. Just before he left for the Council of Chalcedon, he "summoned the clergy, and gathered the monks and the people together; and exposed this false doctrine," (namely the doctrine of the Tome of Leo)" "and anathematised it. . . .And he charged them all, that if he should be perverted in the Synod, they should hold communion with him no more."[1] We have already noted the way Juvenal made his submission at the Council. However, subsequent to the adjournment of the Council, when Juvenal returned to his see, his flock offered him the choice either of abjuring the Council or of withdrawing from the see. Juvenal went to Constantinople and returned at the head of an army. By the time he thus made his triumphal entry, a man by name Theodosius had been appointed to take his place.[2] In spite of the unstinting imperial support

---

[1] Zacharias of Mitylene, op. cit., p. 49.

[2] Ibid., pp. 49-50, 52-53. B. J. Kidd, in his work, The Churches of Eastern Christendom, and W. A. Wigram, in The Separation of the Monophysites, refer to this incident (Kidd, pp. 5f. , Wigram, pp. 17-19). Of these two, the former's account is the Chalcedonian version of events. The latter has tried to show some appreciation for the other side. Both, however, omit one important fact. Having raised objection to the consecration of Timothy of Alexandria (see below pp. 201f.), on the ground that only two bishops participated in the service, neither of them has any such criticism against Theodosius. This means that there were three or more bishops associated with the see of Jerusalem to consecrate Theodosius in opposition to Chalcedon. Theodosius himself consecrated bishops. Regarding them also no irregularity has been charged. Therefore, there was a regular succession of bishops on the non-Chalcedonian side in the province of Palestine.

Kidd, however, gives the impression that the revolt against Juvenal was the work of unruly monks supported by Eudocia, the widow of Theodosius II. Neither this reading which he enjoyed, Juvenal did not have any unanimous support of the Church in the province of Palestine. His successor Anastasius and his suffragans were among those who signed the Encyclical of Basiliscus in 476,[1] which nullified Chalcedon. Therefore, the Chalcedonian party which Juvenal had formed dwindled into insignificance with his death.

In an introductory survey of this kind it is not possible to deal with the details of history. The point to be noted is that Theodosius, the first outspoken critic of Chalcedon after Dioscorus, was a critic also of ideas which were associated with the name of Eutyches.[2] The imperial orders to arrest him led him to adopt a wandering life in disguise for the strengthening of his fellow believers. At last he was seized and imprisoned in a house containing lime, as the non-Chalcedonian historian reports. During his incarceration, Chalcedonians tried to convert him to their party, but with no success. "Eutychian" sympathisers also approached him, thinking that he was one among them. But he exposed the teaching of the latter

---

of the event, nor his statement that Juvenal convened a Council in Jerusalem and "got things in order" (Ibid., p. 6) takes into account the existence of an ecclesiastical body in Jerusalem opposed to Juvenal and the Council. The fact is that he formed a Chalcedonian party in Jerusalem and, by using state forces, got his opponents out of the way.

[1] Zacharias, op. cit., p. 107. Kidd, op. cit., p. 14

[2] Zacharias, p. 56.

as a worse heresy "than that of Paul of Samosata, Apollinarius and Nestorius." He also wrote treatises against a certain John the Rhetorician of Alexandria who, according to Zacharias, took advantage of the conflict in Alexandria to disseminate his views which conceived of the manhood of Christ as without a nature of its own, as it was born of a Virgin.[1] This was obviously Monophysitism, and it was a similar view that Basil of Seleucia had tried at Chalcedon to read into Eutyches.[2] We have seen that Dioscorus had made it clear immediately that it was heretical. Now Theodosius expressed his opposition to it by means of his treatises. It must be remembered that Leo of

---

[1] Zacharias, op. cit., p. 57. Wigram, op. cit., p. 19. Wigram refers to John the Rhetorician as having belonged to the "first-fruits of the multitudinous divisions of his party," namely the party of Theodosius. According to Wigram, the non-Chalcedonian position represented by Severus of Antioch was as orthodox as the Chalcedonian, but it was schismatic, because it was divided in itself (see below pp. 223). Behind this theory of Wigram lies the idea that the Eastern Christological heresies subsequent to the Council of Chalcedon were all subdivisions of the non-Chalcedonian group. We shall have occasion later to see that this theory is wrong. The point to be noted in the present context is this. Theodosius and his section of the Church found it difficult to accept the Council's doctrinal decision. When, however, they found heretical teachers spreading their views, they resisted such men too. According to Zacharias, whose work is the source book of Wigram, John the Rhetorician was a student of philosophy. With his metaphysical speculation he endeavoured to combine Christian ideas and made an effort to interpret the Person of Christ. To regard him as a representative of the non-Chalcedonian position, or as one who broke away from it, is unfair to it.

[2] See above pp. 21.

Rome had written to Eudocia on June 15, 451,[1] that his version of the Catholic Faith was "equally opposed to Nestorianism and to Eutychianism." In this correspondence, the bishop of Rome did not, in fact, answer the point of the protest represented by Theodosius.

A more important leader of the opposition to Chalcedon during the first generation after the Council was Timothy of Alexandria.[2] The Council of Chalcedon had appointed one Proterius to take the place of the deposed Dioscorus. The hold he had on Christians in Egypt was such that he had to be perpetually escorted by soldiers.[3] The Egyptian Church continued to regard Dioscorus as its archbishop till his death in 454. However, fearing a ruthless bloodshed, a successor was not appointed to him till the death of Marcian in 457. When the news of the emperor's death reached Alexandria, the leaders of the Church took advantage of the absence of the General Dionysius and in haste consecrated Timothy.[4] Having heard

---

[1] Kidd, op. cit., pp. 6-7.

[2] Aelurus was his surname. His Chalcedonian opponents, in trying to vilify his person, did not spare even his surname. In adopting a verbal translation of Aelurus, modern historians like Kidd are unfair to the man.

[3] Wigram, op. cit., pp. 16-17. Zacharias, p. 48.

[4] Regarding the consecration of Timothy Aelurus, Kidd writes: "Timothy had but two consecrators, both of whom had previously been deposed by Proterius and the

heard of it, the General hurried back and arrested Timothy. However, in consequence of the riot that followed, the General had to give way and release the bishop.

An incident related by Zacharias will bring out the comparative hold which Timothy and Proterius had on Christians in Alexandria.

> And when Timothy had returned to the great church from which he had been forcibly removed, and Proterius had taken for himself the church which is called Quirinian, and Easter came round, children without number were brought to Timothy to be baptised; so that because of their multitude those who were writing and reading out their names became weary; but only five were brought to Proterius.[1]

Egyptian synod; and after playing the anti-Patriarch for a few days, he was expelled by the General Dionysius" (op. cit., p. 8). According to the Apostolic Canons, a consecration by two bishops is valid and regular (Hefele, History of the Councils, Eng. tr., I, p. 458). The value of a synodical decision under the leadership of Proterius was not much in the case of the Egyptian Church.

Wigram's view in regard to the irregularity of Timothy's consecration is based on a deeper principle. For according to him, it lay in the fact that one of the two bishops who officiated did not have a diocese in Egypt. However, having recognised the consecration effected in Antioch by Lucifer of Cagliari, the West had no right to raise objection to Timothy on this ground.

The fact seems to be that, realising the emergency of the situation, Dioscorus himself had instructed the Church in Egypt to avail itself of the services of bishops from other provinces (Zacharias, p. 99). Timothy's consecration had to be conducted in haste. The important point about Timothy is that the entire section of the Church in Egypt which venerated Dioscorus accepted him as their rightful bishop.

[1] Zacharias, pp. 65-66.

Proterius was murdered. According to Zacharias, it was done by a soldier, being irritated by the bishop's insatiable demand of his opponents' blood.[1] According to Evagrius, Proterius was murdered by a man of Timothy's side instigated by the latter.[2] Both accounts may be doubted. Now that Timothy alone was left at the head of the Church in Egypt, the leading men of the Chalcedonian side in Alexandria appealed to him to recognise them and unify the Church. This move did not reach fruition because the Chalcedonian party itself could not be united on the issue.[3]

This success of Timothy was short-lived. Leo, the emperor who succeeded Marcian, was impartial on the religious question, and, seeing the disunity among his subjects on account of the Council of Chalcedon, he was willing to convene another Council to set matters right.[4] However, Anatolius of Constantinople easily gained control of the situation, and he suggested the taking of a referendum of bishops on the question whether the Council of Chalcedon was to be accepted and whether Timothy's consecration was regular. This was a great set-back to Timothy; for all the bishops to whom the imperial encyclical was sent testified against Timothy and all, but Amphilocius of Side, in favour of the Council. On the strength of this referendum, Timothy was exiled first to Gangra and then to Cherson.[1] His route to Gangra lay along the coast of Palestine, and the reception accorded to him everywhere he stopped on the way was a testimony to the fact that in all those places there were people to pay homage to him.[2]

---

[1] _Ibid._, p. 66. [2] Evagrius, p. 71.

[3] Zacharias, pp. 67-68. [4] _Ibid._, p. 69.

Timothy remained in exile for eighteen years, all through the reign of Leo. In 476, when the intruder Basiliscus assumed power, he was recalled. He returned to Alexandria by way of Constantinople and Ephesus. In the former, he encouraged Basiliscus to issue his *Encyclical* condemning the Council of Chalcedon and the *Tome* of Leo. In the latter he was president of a Council of Eastern bishops who approved the encyclical.

During his stay in Constantinople he opposed "Eutychian" heretics, a fact the importance of which will engage our attention later. The Council of Ephesus over which he presided took the place of the one proposed by Leo the emperor in 458 and had not met. Its doctrinal position was that of Basiliscus' Encyclical.[1] It opposed the Chalcedonian definition of the Faith as well as the administrative arrangement the Council had adopted. Chalcedon, for instance, had decided that Ephesus should be under the jurisdiction of Constantinople. Now this Council decided against that decree of the Council of 451.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 76-77. Zacharias says that when Timothy was arrested the people of Alexandria started a riot to rescue their archbishop and that in the turmoil they killed many. In the end the army won, and Timothy was carried away. The hold he had on Christians in Egypt may be imagined from this story.

[2] On the way to Gangra he was honoured by people of the coastal areas of Palestine. Requested by Eustathius of Berytus (the man who, at Chalcedon, deserted Dioscorus and made his submission to the powerful party), he halted at Berytus, where he was given a public reception by the citizens.

From Ephesus Timothy proceeded to Alexandria, where a people who, for eighteen years, had been eagerly waiting to see his most welcome return received him with extreme warmth and cordiality.[2] Basiliscus could hold his own only for a short time. He was put down by Zeno who was emperor till 491. Towards the close of his brief reign, Basiliscus, hoping to appease Acacius of Constantinople, published his Counter-encyclical, abrogating the earlier one. This, however, was too late, and Acacius had already stirred up the monastic body against Basiliscus,[1] and helped Zeno regain the empire.

---

[1] See below pp. 207f.

[2] The reception Timothy had in Alexandria on his return is very significant. For Proterius, the Chalcedonian bishop had been succeeded by another Timothy surnamed Salophaciolus, a man beyond his age in his conciliatory spirit. In order to heal the schism in Egypt, he went so far as to include the name of Dioscorus in the diptychs (Zacharias, p. 114), for which he was taken to task by Leo of Rome (Wigram, p. 28). Even the graciousness of this great soul had not led the Egyptians to swerve from their loyalty to Timothy Aelurus.

Once secure on the throne, Zeno ordered the repeal of everything that Basiliscus had done. This affected the non-Chalcedonian section, for its leaders were again banished. However, in the case of Timothy, consideration either for his old age or for the thousands of deaths his execution would inaugurate, led Zeno to disregard the demand of bishop Simplicius of Rome to execute Timothy as a thank-offering to God for his return.[2] On his return from exile Timothy had brought with him the bones of Dioscorus. Having buried them with his predecessors in the see of Alexandria, Timothy died soon.

According to the account of Zacharias, though he opposed the Tome of Leo and the Council of Chalcedon, as a man, Timothy was noble and generous even to his opponents. The Chalcedonian historian Evagrius does not dispute any of the statements of Zacharias regarding Timothy. After his return from his exile, he found his namesake on the

---

[1] Evagrius, op. cit., p. 129. Zacharias, p. 113. This is an indication of the fact that there were monks on both sides, and that they fought for their respective parties. Therefore, A. C. Headlam's theory that the non-Chalcedonian position was peculiar to Egyptian monks is untrue to facts. For his theory, see Introduction to A Study in Christology by H. M. Relton, pp. ix-x.

Chalcedonian side, having had to maintain himself by manual labour, and ordered a "Denarius" a day be paid to him by his section of the Church.[1]

A brief survey of Timothy's theological position also may be attempted here. That even Kidd admits that he was opposed to "Eutychianism" is gratifying.[2] In order to evaluate his Christology, we have a few of his writings preserved by Zacharias who also relates his dealings with both Chalcedonians and "Eutychians."

In respect of Chalcedon, his objection was this. Both the Chalcedonian formula and the _Tome_ of Leo, in his view, contained the same teaching as that of Nestorius, which had been condemned by the Council of Ephesus in 431. So he opposed them and subscribed to the _Encyclical_ of Basiliscus. This document accepted as authoritative the Nicene and the Constantinopolitan Creeds and the doctrinal decisions of the two Ephesian Councils. It expressly condemned the _Tome_ of Leo and the Council of Chalcedon. On the ideas ascribed to Eutyches it "anathematised the heresy of those who do not confess that the only begotten Son of God was truly incarnate and made man of the Holy

---

[1] Zacharias, pp. 111-112. Kidd refers to this allowance as a "penny a day" (_op. cit._, p. 12). A "denarius" is certainly not a penny.

[2] _Op. cit._, p. 10.

Spirit and of the holy and ever-virgin Mary, Mother of God, but according to their conceit, /He became incarnate/ either from heaven, or in phantasy and seeming."[1]

The significant fact about the statement contained in the Encyclical is that it does not say how the mystery of the Incarnation is to be conceived. It takes objection to the Council of Chalcedon, and expresses satisfaction over the earlier tradition of the Church as contained in the decisions of previous Councils including that of 449. In other words, it was as one-sided as the decision of Chalcedon. There is another point of historical interest in regard to this document. It does not condemn Eutyches by name. We shall refer to this omission in a moment.

Timothy stated his objection to the Tome and the Council of Chalcedon in his letter to emperor Leo written in 457 or 458. A diplomatic letter, it was intended to make clear that the writer maintained the historic Faith without falling into either of the two extreme positions symbolised by the words "Nestorianism" and "Eutychianism." Having confessed the Nicene doctrine of homoousia, Timothy treats in that letter[2] his view of the Incarnation.

> For thus also the three hundred and eighteen blessed fathers taught concerning the true Incarnation of our

---

[1] For the full Encyclical, see Evagrius, op. cit., pp. 122-126.

[2] For the letter, see Zacharias, op. cit., pp. 70-73.

> Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ that He became man, according to His dispensation, which He Himself knows."

Then he goes on to condemn by name Apollinarius and Nestorius, and makes it clear that he rejects Nestorius,

> both those who hold erroneous views about the Incarnation of Jesus Christ, who became flesh from us; and introduce into Him the cleavage in two, and divide asunder even the dispensation of the Only-begotten Son of God; and those, on the other hand, who say with respect to His body that it was taken from heaven, or that God the Word was changed, or that He suffered in His own nature; and who do not confess that to a human body[1] what pertains to the soul derived from us was united.

In regard to the Tome, he says that the statements in Leo's letter are in accord with the doctrine of Nestorius

> Who was condemned for cleaving asunder and dividing the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ, in respect of natures, and persons, and properties, and names, and operations; who also interpreted the words of Scriptures to mean two (natures), which are not contained in the Confession of the Faith of the three hundred and eighteen. For they declared that the Only-begotten Son of God, who is of the same nature with the Father, came down, and became incarnate and was made man; and suffered, and rose again, and ascended to heaven; and shall come to judge the quick and the dead. And natures, and persons, and properties were not mentioned by them, nor did they divide them. But they confessed the divine and the human properties to be of One by the dispensation.
>
> Accordingly, I do not agree with the transactions of Chalcedon, because I find in them divisions and cleavage of the dispensation.

---

[1] Michael the Syrian quotes this statement as "a human and soul-possessing body assumed from us." Ecclesiastical History (Syriac), p. 242.

From this letter it is clear that Timothy affirmed of Christ that His body animated with a soul was taken from us; that in the dispensation the Only-begotten Son of God did not undergo any change; and that Christ's suffering was not in the divine nature. In other words, for Timothy, the Son of God assumed real human nature in its fulness. By means of this affirmation, he excluded the ideas ascribed to Eutyches. However, he did not condemn Eutyches by name. As we have seen, the Encyclical of Basiliscus of 476 which Timothy subscribed also did not condemn the old monk by name. It was an age when Church leaders had no patience with men whom they believed to have taught heresy. If the leaders of the non-Chalcedonian group were convinced that he had held the views ascribed to him, having rejected those views, they would have condemned the man also. This adds to our reading of facts that the connection between Eutyches and "Eutychianism" has to be doubted.

With reference to the Council of Chalcedon and the Tome of Leo, Timothy expresses his objection that they were akin to the teaching of Nestorius. We can very well say that Timothy, on this point, misunderstood both the doctrine of Nestorius and the theological basis of Chalcedon. The misunderstanding of Nestorius on the part of Timothy was not different from that on the part of Chalcedon itself. Having raised objection to Chalcedon, Timothy does not, in fact, spell out his own Christological position. However, in regard to the charge that the non-Chalcedonian position was "Eutychianism," we have sufficient evidence to say that Timothy excluded it. Two facts may be adduced in support of this statement. (a) During his exile he addressed himself to the refutation of "the Eutychianists;" and (b) on his way back from exile, he confronted them and exposed their heresy.

(a) The first happened, according to Zacharias,[1] in connection with the sojourn in Constantinople of two Alexandrines--Isaiah bishop of Hermopolis and Theophilus a presbyter of Alexandria.[2] These men came to Constantinople to collect money, and circulated the news that they belonged to the party of Timothy Aelurus. When he received reports of their activity, the Alexandrine bishop in exile wrote two letters to Constantinople. The first of the two was intended to exhort the men to give up their ideas. When they were found unyielding, Timothy wrote his second letter, which was doctrinal in character. On the point at issue, he wrote in it:

---

[1] A considerable part of Timothy's work against the "Eutychianists" is preserved by Zacharias, pp. 81-99.

[2] Zacharias, p. 81.

> Accordingly, let no one, thinking to honour God, insult His mercy by refusing to obey the doctrine of the holy fathers, who have declared that our Lord Jesus Christ is of the same nature with us in the flesh, and is one with His flesh.[1]

The author then quoted the Epistle to the Hebrews 2:14-18 and commented:

> For this expression, "He was made like us in all points," teaches all those who desire to be meet for the blessings of heaven and to be redeemed, that they must confess the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ as being from Mary the holy Virgin and Theotokos; Christ who was of the same nature with her and with us in the flesh, and of the same nature with the Father in His Godhead.[2]

In the same letter, Timothy produced passages from writings ascribed to Athanasius, Julius of Rome, the Cappadocians, Gregory Thaumaturgus, Ambrose and Cyril to prove that these men were wrong, and that their views were opposed to the orthodox tradition of the Church.

Finally Timothy excommunicated the two Alexandrine sojourners in the royal city. The letter written for that purpose is also preserved by Zacharias.[3] After explaining the purpose of his two earlier letters which, he says, were written in the hope that the two men would abandon their unorthodox views, and making it clear that he failed in his efforts, Timothy writes:

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 83.

[2] Zacharias, pp. 83-84.

[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 96-99.

> And I now give sentence upon Isaiah and Theophilus who say that the body of the Lord is of His own divine nature, and not of ours, thereby cutting themselves off from the fellowship of the holy fathers and mine; that no man henceforth hold communion with them.

With reference to Timothy, we can say that he was not interested in using even the Alexandrine phrases. For him, Christ's human life was the dispensation of the Son of God consubstantial with the Father. The human life was real and perfect, because the Son of God assumed human nature from Mary the Theotokos. Thus Christ was of the same nature with God the Father in his Godhead and of the same nature with us in His manhood. He was not only of the same nature with us in His flesh, but was also one with His flesh. In other words, Timothy affirmed against "Eutychianism" every theological principle which a sound Christian thinker of the fifth or the sixth century would have pressed in opposition to that way of thinking.

Though he did not state clearly his own Christology in opposition to Chalcedon and the Tome of Leo, there are two indications in his anti-"Eutychian" writing to which we have referred providing a clue to his thinking. On the one hand, he regarded as central to his theology the affirmation that the Son of God in His incarnate state was "one with His flesh;" and on the other, in a passage which he quoted from pseudo-Julius of Rome there is an idea which the Hamilton and Brooks' translation of Zacharias gives in this way, namely that "the nature of the body was not separate."[1] The emphasis here is that, though the human nature is real and perfect, it exists only in union with the divine nature. We shall see later that this idea was forcibly stressed by Severus of Antioch.

So far as we have evidence, the Christology of Timothy was the same as that of Dioscorus, which we have tried to spell out on the strength of his admissions. Both these men had an intense fear of the phrase "in two natures." In the historical context in which they lived, they could see in it only an emphasis which the Church had already excluded as "Nestorianism."

(b) The second evidence for saying that Timothy excluded "Eutychianism" is his treatment of men of that way of thinking in Constantinople. We have already noted that on his way back from exile, Timothy halted in the imperial city and encouraged Basiliscus to publish his Encyclical. This document anathematised every one who affirmed that the Incarnation was in semblance. The legitimacy of this statement was called in question by some people in Constantinople. These men approached Timothy, a critic of Chalcedon, thinking that he would make common cause with them. Contrary to their expectation, Timothy turned the tables against them, instructing them that

---

[1] According to Michael the Syrian who preserves a version of Zacharias, the passage reads, ܡܛܠ ܕܠܘ ܡܢܗ ܘܠܗ ܗܘܐ ܟܝܢܐ ܕܦܓܪܐ. (p. 245). A literal translation would be, "For the nature of the body is not of itself nor unto itself." In other words, the human nature does not have an independent existence.

> the Scriptures teach us that Christ was made in all points like unto us, and took our nature perfectly, yet without the motions of sin. And although He was born supernaturally without copulation, nevertheless He became perfect Man, having been conceived in the Virgin Mary, and from her born through the Holy Spirit.

He then made a written statement, declaring that "Christ was like us in everything belonging to humanity."[1]

On the strength of these facts, we can say most definitely that, in characterising Timothy as "that heretic, that parricide, more detestable than Cain,"[2] Simplicius of Rome was giving expression not only to the general sickness of ecclesiastical leaders of his day, but also to the spirit of intolerance Leo had evinced to achieve his goal of Roman suzerainty over the entire Church.

There is another important point to be noted in this context. As we have seen, the non-Chalcedonian ecclesiastical leaders were, from the time "Eutychian" ideas came to be expressed, opposed to them. These ideas were expressed by men all over the East. In fact, they did not proceed from the non-Chalcedonian protest against the Council. It was in Constantinople that Timothy Aelurus, a critic of Chalcedon, came into direct encounter with men who held these views, and Constantinople was not a seat of the non-Chalcedonians, especially in 476. Therefore, the "Eutychians" of Constantinople, from where the imperial authorities had been enforcing Chalcedon ever since 451, were men who broke away, not from the anti-Chalcedonian party, but from the Chalcedonian party.[1] But Timothy Aelurus made it clear to them that he would have nothing to do with their theological position. On the strength of this fact, we can most certainly say that the Tome of Leo was not the only antidote against the "Eutychian" heresy, and that Leo's arbitration in an Eastern theological controversy helped to widen the division of the one Christian Community into two enduring groups.

---

[1] Zacharias, *op. cit.*, p. 110. The preposition "in" in Syriac is   . It can mean "in" and "by." In this context it should be "by," though we reproduce here Hamilton and Brooks' translation.

[2] According to Wigram (*op. cit.*, p. 31), when Simplicius of Rome heard of the esteem conferred on Timothy Aelurus during his short stay in Constantinople, he gave expression to his horror in these words in a letter.

We must now pass on to a brief survey of the religious situation in Antioch and Syria. Both in Syria and Palestine there was a strong party on either side.[1] In spite of imperial disfavour and the consequent handicaps, the non-Chalcedonian party was ever active to oust their opponents from leadership in the Church. Antioch, the home of Dyophysite theology had votaries of the Mia-physite[2] theology also. We do not have any record of their activities during the first decade after Chalcedon. In the episcopate of Martyrius (454-470) they asserted themselves, drove out the Chalcedonian incumbent of the see, and raised Peter the Fuller[3] in his place. The state now interfered and Peter was banished. During the short reign of Basiliscus he was restored. He and Timothy Aelurus met in Constantinople, from where the two men proceeded to Ephesus and took part in the Council that met there. The triumph of Peter was of short duration. For, when Zeno came to power, he ordered Peter's banishment. As Martyrius retired, the state put in Stephen, whom the critics of the Council murdered in church. In the words of Kidd, "an orthodox election" (a Chalcedonian election) "at Antioch was quite impossible."[1] So Calandion, the nominee of Acacius of Constantinople, was recognised by Chalcedonians of the province as their bishop of Antioch.[2] He held the see from 481 to 485. As he was unwilling to accept Zeno's Henotikon. Peter was again restored to the see rendered vacant by Calandion's ejection. This time Peter the Fuller convened a synod of the province and wrote to Peter Mongus of Alexandria a letter of union, which is preserved by Zacharias.[3]

---

[1] This fact may be compared to the statement of Wigram (n. 1, p. 200 above) that John the Rhetorician was an off-spring of the non-Chalcedonian group.

---

[1] In treating the case of Juvenal of Jerusalem, Wigram says that he maintained himself apparently without difficulty, "because the malcontents were in a local minority" (*op. cit.*, p. 19). But in dealing with the situation in Syria, he says that "all over Syria and Palestine there was an active Monophysite minority" (*Ibid.*, p. 29). That these two statements do not tally with each other is obvious. As for majority and minority, which formed which is not possible to tell.

[2] The ground on which the critics of the Council have been characterised as "Monophysites" is that they adhered to the phrase μία φύσις -- σεσαρκωμενη However, the question whether from this "Monophysite" can be derived, or whether they have ever accepted this epithet has never been examined. Since they used the phrase μία φύσις we may refer to them as "Mia-physite."

[3] As Wigram suggests (*op. cit.*, p. 29) his name "Fuller" may well have been taken from his monastic trade. In the case of Peter, it must be remembered that no objection has been raised on the ground that an insufficient number of bishops had officiated at his consecration. This implies that at least three bishops had been there in Antioch to perform the ceremony in opposition to Chalcedon and the state.

Peter's contribution, namely the addition he made to the Trisagion, came to be recognised and appreciated by Chalcedonians only after his death. He inserted "Who wast crucified for us" between "Holy God, Holy the

---

[1] Kidd, op. cit., p. 14.

[2] The consecration of Calandion by Acacius was opposed to all canonical regulations. Simplicius of Rome had no objection to it. See Wigram's comment on the incident (n. on p.36).

[3] Zacharias, pp. 126-128.

Mighty, Holy the Immortal" and "have mercy on us." The addition was based on the Cyrilline emphasis that God the Word suffered for us in the flesh, and Peter's idea in making it was to establish the charge against Chalcedonians that they separated the human nature of Christ from the divine. For a long time it was unpalatable to the Chalcedonians. However, in the sixth century, by agreeing to say that one of the Trinity suffered in the flesh, the Scythian monks sanctioned the theological idea which Peter was trying to conserve. Peter had no intention of maintaining an "absorptionist" Christology, for he included in his synodal letter to Alexandria the words, "by the will of our Lord and Brother Jesus Christ."[1]

Protest against Chalcedon was evident in other parts of the East also. Constantinople itself was not free from it, and Asia Minor was actually divided. In this context, we may glance at the Eastern episcopate. At Chalcedon, when the Council started, a large number of Eastern Churchmen were on the side of Dioscorus, and, as we have seen, a hundred and fifty of a total number of three hundred and fifty bishops did not take part in the special gathering that deposed the bishop of Alexandria. Two years earlier, most of these men had shouted at Ephesus against those who would dare mention "two natures," "Take and burn;" those who used the phrase "ought to be divided into two."[1] Even after signing the Tome at Chalcedon, almost the entire Eastern episcopate tried their best not to have the phrase "in two natures" inserted in the Council's definition of the Faith. However, at the end they yielded to the argument of the commissioners and accepted the phrase. From the time of the Council, in spite of all imperial efforts to enforce its doctrinal decision, the non-Chalcedonians could maintain a regular succession of bishops to perpetuate the ministry of the Church on their side. In 457, when emperor Leo took a referendum, almost all the bishops to whom the circular was sent voted in favour of the Council. In 476 about five hundred of the Eastern bishops accepted the Encyclical of Basiliscus which openly condemned the Council. After the lapse of a year, some of the very same men supported the intruder's Counter-Encyclical. When Zeno came back to power these men were again on the side of Chalcedon.

---

[1] This fact may be compared to H. M. Relton's portrayal of the non-Chalcedonian position which, in his view, is "Eutychianism." According to this scholar, their objection to "two natures" was due to their rejection of "one whole side of the Incarnation mystery," whereby they could not speak of Christ "as the Pattern Man, the Elder Brother, the High Priest, 'like unto His brethren in all

---

things, sin excepted,'" and what not. (A Study in Christology, pp. 30-32). That Christ is our brother was affirmed by Dioscorus. See above p.175. For the letter of Peter, see Zachariah, p. 127.

[1] So they shouted against Eusebius of Dorylaeum (See above p. 36).

In the same reign most of the East signed the *Henotikon* of 482, practically nullifying Chalcedon.

This thoroughly laughable inconsistency on the part of Eastern bishops needs an explanation. To say that they were simply yielding to the policy of emperors is not the whole truth. We can definitely say that most Churchmen in the East were not clear-sighted theologians. They wanted to exclude the notions ascribed both to Nestorius and to Eutyches. They knew that both the adherents of the Council and their opponents were doing that. So these men could feel as much at home in one party as in the other. That this reading of the situation was maintained even by scholarly men in ancient times may be substantiated by referring to Evagrius, the Chalcedonian historian of the sixth century. In dealing with the massacres and tumults in the days of Juvenal of Jerusalem and Timothy Aelurus, he writes:

> Such was the device of the envious and God-hating demon in the change of a single letter, that, while in reality the one expression was completely inductive of the notions of the other, still with the generality the discrepancy between them was held to be considerable, and the ideas conveyed by them to be clearly diametric opposition, and exclusive of each other: whereas he who confesses Christ in two natures, clearly affirms Him to be from two, inasmuch as by confessing Christ at once in Godhead and manhood, he asserts His consistence from Godhead and manhood; and, on the other hand, the position of one who affirms His origin from two natures, in

> completely inclusive of His existence in two, inasmuch as he who affirms Christ to be from Godhead and manhood, confesses His existence in Godhead and manhood, since there is no conversion of the flesh into Godhead, nor a transition of the Godhead into the flesh, from which substances arises the ineffable union.[1]

The mediating position taken up by Evagrius is to be commended. But his point of view does not answer why, if the two phrases meant the same thing, a section of the bishops at Chalcedon were constrained to depose Dioscorus, and why the victorious party at the Council insisted that the phrase "in two natures" should be adopted. As we have seen, Dioscorus most certainly had a theological emphasis, which, he believed, would be endangered by adopting the phrase. Evagrius apparently had not understood it.

In order to bring out our point clearly, we may refer in this context to the judgment on the non-Chalcedonian position given by Kidd and Wigram. Both these historians reserve the epithets "orthodox" and "Catholic" to the Chalcedonian body, and "Monophysite" to the non-Chalcedonian. Unless they assume the position that the Council of Chalcedon was ecumenical, and as such only those who accepted its doctrinal decree deserved to be designated as orthodox or Catholic, their division of the epithets between the two bodies is puzzling. Wigram, in fact, is not unaware of this problem. Referring to the Henotikon, which will engage our attention in a moment, he writes:

---

[1] Evagrius, op. cit., pp. 65-66.

> The fact that this document became one of the standards of the "Jacobite" body is enough to prove how far they are removed from that idea of the denial of the true humanity of Christ to which the word Monophysitism suggests to us.[1]

This is a clear admission that the word "Monophysitism" implies heresy, and that it is not applicable to the majority of Easterns who opposed the Council. Wigram, however, continues to refer to the non-Chalcedonian group as "Monophysite," and goes on to argue that, in any case, they were schismatics. The basis on which this charge is levelled needs some comment here. Wigram writes:

> Thus passed the decade 460-470. Chalcedon was acknowledged, but in an uneasy way, and the Monophysite attitude is best described by the phrase "sullen estrangement." The best hope of the orthodox lay in the divisions of their opponents, for it must be owned that, however good a debating case they could show, the Monophysites in their internal divisions set a terrible example of the schismatic spirit. It might be arguable that the universal enforcement of a party formula was unjustifiable, and that the anti-Chalcedonian party were the true conservatives, but by their own acts they wrote themselves down Schismatics.[2]

The logic of this argument is very confusing. For, according to Wigram, the non-Chalcedonians were schismatics, not because they could be accused of having defied the established authority of the Church, but because, "in their internal divisions," they "set a terrible example of the schismatic spirit." From this premise, Wigram concludes that therefore "they wrote themselves down Schismatics." In other words, Wigram seems to think that the fact of a "schismatic spirit" is enough ground for regarding an ecclesiastical tradition as schismatic.

---

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 42.

[2] *Op. cit.*, p. 29.

The very use of the term "schismatic spirit" implies the fact of a defiance of something already established. We can definitely say that any real Monophysitism in the fifth century was both heretical and schismatic. It can also be granted that Monophysitism could find a more congenial atmosphere among non-Chalcedonians than among Chalcedonians. The fact, however, is that there were "Eutychianists" in Alexandria, Constantinople and probably in Syria. As we shall see later, there were votaries of the tenets of Julian of Halicarnassus on both sides. Therefore, the schismatic spirit of which Wigram speaks was a characteristic of the age, and even if Dioscorus had not opposed the Council of Chalcedon, it would have offered a resistance to the Church. If, on the other hand, it can be shown that the non-Chalcedonian leaders did not pay sufficient attention to the danger of Monophysitism, or that they were willing to be satisfied with a mere acceptance of the Alexandrine phrase "one incarnate nature," the charge that they let a "schismatic spirit" to have its free expression could have some bearing on them. This, however, was not the case. From the beginning of their repudiation of the Council of Chalcedon, they opposed the prevalent heretical tendencies with as much force as they could muster. Therefore, the fact that there were heresies in the East--heresies which they actually excluded--cannot make them schismatics.

The point of view of Kidd seems to be that the Chalcedonian Definition of the Faith was the only norm of orthodoxy. But for a long time after Chalcedon it was not easy to be established in the East. So he admits in connection with his treatment of the situation in Antioch where in 478 a Chalcedonian election could not be held:

> The mere record of these events is enough to show the daring of the Monophysites, and to what impotence they had reduced both the see of Antioch and the school of Theodore and Diodore, Nestorius and Theodoret, so long and so intimately associated with it.[1]

Kidd does not show even an awareness of the problem which Leo's Tome might have produced in the mind of a Dioscorus who was bred in the Alexandrine theological tradition. On this point, the judgment of Loofs that

---

[1] Kidd, op. cit., p. 14.

"there was at that time in the East no Cyrilline theology, i.e., no theology following the Cyrilline tradition, which could digest Leo's letter"[1] is based most certainly on accurate scholarship. Had, however, Loofs noted the fact that at Chalcedon, the bishops had shouted of Cyril and Leo that they had thought alike, he would have had more appreciation for the protest of Dioscorus. In the fifth century, as Loofs says, "the decision of Chalcedon was interpreted in very different ways by the Western Church, by the adherents of Cyril, and by Theodoret and Ibas and other Antiochenes."[2] It was this flexibility that the second Council of Constantinople in 553 gave up.[3] This itself was the result of a new theological development among Chalcedonians, which had its starting point in Zeno's Henotikon. We may sketch briefly the context in which it was published.

The reigns of Marcian and Leo, as we have seen, were in every way favourable to the Chalcedonian party. However, Egypt, Palestine and Syria were seething with discontentment. Timothy Aelurus died in 477 or 478. His namesake on the Chalcedonian side was also a very old man. Zeno had hoped that, in the case of the death of either of them, the division in Egypt could be healed by recognising the other as the sole bishop. But the courier who brought the tidings of Timothy Aelurus' death brought also the news that a successor to him was appointed in the person of Peter Mongus. In Jerusalem, Anastasius, the successor of Juvenal, had signed the Encyclical of Basiliscus and remained loyal to it till his death. He was succeeded by Martyrius, who openly declared himself on the non-Chalcedonian side. The situation in Antioch was so terrifying that a Chalcedonian bishop was murdered and a successor to him could not be appointed, with the result that Chalcedonians in Antioch had to be satisfied with Calandion whom Acacius of Constantinople had consecrated. The other party had a bishop in the person of Peter the Fuller who had been banished by imperial orders. It was in this context that Zeno thought it advisable to work for the unification of the two parties on the basis of the Henotikon.

---

[1] Nestorius, pp. 100-101. [2] Ibid., p. 99.

[3] Wigram deplores the decisions of this Council (p. 130). Without endorsing the rightness of that Council's decision, one can very well say that it was consistent with the Council of Ephesus in 431.

This document described the religious atmosphere of the East which led to its publication in these moving words:

> For it has happened that of the generations without number which Time, during these many years of life, has removed; some, deprived of

> the Laver of Regeneration, have passed away; and others, without participation in the divine Communion, have been carried off by the inevitable journey of mankind; and through the profuse blood-shedding, not the earth alone, but even the very air has been defiled. Who would not pray that this state of things may be exchanged for a good one?[1]

In an age when all good people in Christendom were groaning for peace, this document, drawn up possibly by Acacius of Constantinople, was published by Zeno in 482.[2]

In regard to the Faith, the Henotikon recognised as the only Sumbol or Creed of the Church "the holy Symbol of the three hundred and eighteen holy fathers, which was also attested by the one hundred and fifty holy fathers." It was this faith that "the holy fathers, who met in Council at Ephesus and deposed the wicked Nestorius and all his successors in doctrine" have followed.

---

[1] Zacharias, op. cit., p. 122. Evagrius op. cit., p. 137.

[2] Regarding the Henotikon, Kidd writes: "Taking advantage, therefore, of the improvement manifest in Monophysite statements of doctrine by contrast with the original Eutychianism, the Patriarch /Acacius/ advised the emperor that, at last reconciliation of Catholic and Monophysite was not impossible" (op. cit., p. 4). As we have seen what the conflict from the beginning was about, this statement of Kidd may be safely ignored. On the failure of the Henotikon, Wigram has another story. "When it was published," he writes, "few wanted reconciliation for its own sake, and those who did could not make their voices heard in the general turmoil. The emperor and the government officials wanted order; the other party leaders wanted controversial victory and the open disgrace of their opponents" (op. cit., p. 42). This statement is, no doubt, partly true to facts. However, Wigram seems to forget the fact that the emperor who signed these moving words was also a man with feeling. To say that his attempt to unify the Church was merely for the sake of order in the empire is certainly not the whole truth. So also he does not take into account his own statement referred to earlier that this document became one of the standards of the non-Chalcedonian body. As we shall see later, a party in that

On the issue between the two parties, it said:

> This Nestorius, together with Eutyches, inasmuch as they held doctrines contrary to what have been here declared, we anathematise. And we also receive the Twelve Heads[1] delivered by the ever-memorable, God-loving Cyril, formerly archbishop of the Catholic Church of Alexandria. But we confess that the Only-begotten Son of God, Himself God, our Lord Jesus Christ, who truly became man; He who is of the same nature with the Father in the Godhead; He who is of the same nature with us in the manhood; He who came down and assumed flesh, through the Holy Ghost, and from Mary the Virgin and *Theotokos*, -- is *one* Son and not *two*. For we affirm that the miracles which he wrought, and the sufferings which He freely endured in the flesh, belong to one Son of God alone. Moreover, we altogether reject those who either divide or confound, or introduce the phantasy.[2] For the true and sinless Incarnation from the *Theotokos* did not cause the addition of a Son.[3] For the Trinity remained

---

group was opposed to union on the basis of the *Henotikon*. Their objection was not to its theology, but to its adequacy for union of the two parties.

[1] The reference is to the twelve anathematisms of Cyril appended to his third letter to Nestorius.

[2] The purpose of this statement was to exclude doectism.

[3] One of the objections to the phrase "in two natures" raised by the critics of the Council of Chalcedon was that it has to conceive of the man Jesus as existing as a man in association with the eternal Son of God. In that case, the man Jesus is a new Son.

> even though God the Word, Who is one of the Trinity, became incarnate.[1]

The *Henotikon* now proceeds to plead for the unity of the Church on the basis of this declaration, and once more makes clear its anathema on

> all who have held, or hold, now or at any time, whether in Chalcedon or in another Synod whatsoever, any different belief; but chiefly those already mentioned, Nestorius and Eutyches and all their followers in the doctrine.[2]

In this document, the only point on which we should not find Dioscorus in explicit agreement is the mention of Eutyches by name. In the light of facts which we have tried to bring out this cannot be regarded as a flaw. So the more important question is: Was the theology of the *Henotikon* orthodox? According to the non-Chalcedonians it was orthodox, for all their leaders recognised it as a standard document. From the point of view of Chalcedonians, it was a document which opposed the Council's decisions on many points. (a) It accepted the third letter of Cyril to Nestorius with the anathematisms as authoritative. (b) Regarding the *Tome* of Leo and the Council's Definition, its attitude was non-committal.

---

[1] Since the Church worships the new Son, and since the Trinity alone is to be worshipped, the new Son must be an addition to the Trinity. Though this question cannot be dismissed, it is necessary to answer another problem, namely the status of the risen and ascended Christ. We shall refer to it in connection with the Christology of Severus.

[2] Zacharias, pp. 122-123, For the full document, see Evagrius, op. cit., pp. 136-139.

(c) The question whether the Council itself was orthodox or not was left an open question. In brief, the Henotikon glorified Cyril at the expense of Leo. So, judged from the point of view of Chalcedon's authority, this document could not be orthodox.

On the other hand, if the concern of Chalcedon itself was to take the Nicene Creed as an inviolable symbol of the Faith and exclude on its basis the two extreme positions characterised by the names of Nestorius and Eutyches, and to give expression to the Christian conviction that in the Person of Jesus Christ there was an inseparable union of real and perfect Godhead and manhood, the Henotikon clearly stated it, without committing any one to the catch-phrases of either party.[1] However, since it left the authority of the Council and the Tome of Leo an open question, Rome's claim to supreme custodianship on matters of the Faith over the entire Church was jeopardised, and the successors of Innocent I and Leo I were not ready to give up the victory their see had achieved at Chalcedon. The Council of 451 itself had met in consequence of an Eastern controversy, and the successors of Eusebius of Dorylaeum and Theodoret of Cyrus were not wanting in the East. Such men, supported by Rome, would have the battle fought on terminological grounds established by one of the largest ecclesiastical assemblies history had till then known, rather than on grounds of theological principles.

---

[1] Regarding the Henotikon, Abbe Duchesne, a Roman Catholic historian, writes: "In its substantial content, if we leave out of account the circumstances in which it was put forward, it could not raise any objection from the side of orthodoxy" (The Early History of the Christian Church, (Eng. tr.) III, p. 349.)

Zeno's political ambitions were limited to the East, and he could well be satisfied with the unification of his dominions. Thus he proceeded with his scheme of bringing reconciliation to his subjects on the basis of the *Henotikon*. It would most probably have borne fruit, if the Chalcedonian East were ready for the final breach between Constantinople and Rome five hundred and seventy years before it actually occurred, and if Zeno could make sure that a Justinian ambitious for the title, "Emperor of East and West" would not arise in another thirty-five years.

We have noted that the non-Chalcedonian party in Egypt appointed Peter Mongus to succeed Timothy Aelurus. Infuriated at the failure of his plan to unite the parties, Zeno expressed threats to impose the death penalty on Peter.[1] However, the intervention of Timothy Salophaciolus, who knew that the death of Peter would be followed by many thousands of other deaths, made the King issue orders for his banishment. Neither of these was of any effect on Peter; for he retired into the Egyptian monasteries and spent his days in hiding till the tide turned. In the meantime the aged Timothy Salophaciolus was reinstated in the see of Alexandria which he held till his death in 482. Thus the mildest of men, whom even his opponents loved, was forced to witness during his last days on earth a series of "tumults and slaughters." Before he died, deputations went to the emperor from both sides. The leader of the Chalcedonian envoys was John Taloia, a priest and monk from Alexandria. Realising the fact that John had already started canvassing for himself, Zeno made him promise that he would not accept the dignity. On this condition Zeno ordered a free election. When it was conducted, the majority asked for the return of Peter, and a minority elected John. The emperor refused to accept the latter, regarding him as a perjurer, but agreed to the Henotikon, which he readily did.[1]

---

[1] Evagrius, *op. cit.*, p. 134. For an unheard-of penalty of this kind, Zeno may well have taken the clue

---

from the letter of Simplicius of Rome who had asked him in 477 to execute the aged Timothy Aelurus as a "thank-offering for his own return" (Wigram, n. on p. 34 cited above p. 215).

[1] Zacharias, pp. 116-120. Wigram, pp. 40-41. This is the incident of which Kidd says that "John was

Now an alliance was formed among the holders of the major sees in the East. Thus Acacius of Constantinople,[1] Peter Mongus of Alexandria, Peter the Fuller of Antioch[2] and Martyrius of Jerusalem exchanged letters[3] accepting one another and expressing unity. This caused the Acacian schism in 484, in spite of which the bishop of Constantinople remained loyal to the Henotikon and the cause of a union of the Church in the East. However, the alliance could not be lasting, for many under the jurisdiction of the Byzentine see were not yet ready for a breach with Rome, and in other sees also there were Chalcedonians who were unwilling to give up the Council. Acacius died in 489 and was succeeded by Fravitta, whose episcopate lasted only a few months. Now Euphemius, a staunch Chalcedonian, became bishop of Constantinople. Grieved at the schism

---

unanimously elected" (Op. cit., p. 15). The fact is that John did not have even the support of the entire Chalcedonian party in Alexandria, which itself was an insignificant minority (Wigram, n. on p. 48).

[1] At the time when Peter was consecrated, Acacius had written to Simplicius of Rome that the consecration was irregular (Wigram, pp. 39-40). However, the irregularity was not such that Acacius could shun his communion now.

[2] Calandion, the creation of Acacius, refused to accept the Henotikon and was therefore ousted from Antioch; Peter the Fuller whom Zeno had banished was now reinstated.

[3] Martyrius was the successor of Anastasius who succeeded Juvenal. For the letters, see Zacharias, pp. 126-131.

with Rome but not at separation from his Eastern neighbours, Euphemius entered into correspondence with Felix of Rome and appealed for reunion. Felix answered that no reunion was possible without a condemnation of Acacius, and there the matter ended for the time being.[1]

Thus Rome was opposed to the Henotikon from the beginning, and there were many in the East to follow the lead of the Western see. One can say that, since that document was essentially Alexandrine, it was one-sided, and that it did not deserve to be recognised as a universal formula of the Faith. At the same time, the fact is that the Chalcedonian objection to it was based on the assumption of the Council's authority.

Part of the reason for the failure of Zeno's attempt lay with the non-Chalcedonian party. As we have noted, Peter Mongus of Alexandria accepted the document and exchanged letters of union with Acacius. However, the monastic body in Egypt and several bishops of the province dissented from Peter on this issue. Their objection was twofold. On the one hand, they were opposed to taking the Henotkion, without an anathema on the Council of Chalcedon and the Tome of Leo, as an adequate basis for uniting the parties; and on the other, they remonstrated against Peter who had entered into union with Acacius who was still a Chalcedonian.[1] In fact, Peter had written a letter to Acacius that, since he had been led to believe on the strength of the latter's words that Chalcedon had not made any innovation to the Faith, he was satisfied.[2] In expressing this sentiment, Peter did not have the support of the Egyptian Church. That, so far as we have evidence, was the root of the problem. If we do not assume that the Council of Chalcedon was exclusively orthodox, we have to grant that these men who opposed Peter were right. No bishop has any right to commit himself to a position, without knowing the mind of his congregation, clergy and fellow bishops of the province. In fact, emperor Zeno himself recognised this fact implicitly. This point also may be substantiated.

---

[1] Wigram, pp. 48-53.

---

[1] Zacharias, pp. 133-134. In treating this incident, Wigram cites the authority of both Evagrius and Zacharias (op. cit., pp. 45-46). But in his account, he draws conclusions which cannot be substantiated by his own references. Since he takes this incident as a sign of the "schismatic spirit" evinced by the non-Chalcedonians, this point has to be examined. According to Wigram, these monks and bishops who protested against Peter were "Monophysite extremists, who had given trouble to Timothy Aelurus," and his only references are Evagrius III; pp. 16, 17, and 22, and Zacharias VI;, pp. 1 and 2. The fact is that neither the Chalcedonian historian Evagrius, nor the non-Chalcedonian Zacharias, refers to these Egyptians as heretics. What we learn from them is only this. Just as Chalcedonians objected to the Henotikon because it did not ratify the Council, these men were opposed to it because it did not expressly condemn the Council. We have no evidence of any Monophysite as having given trouble to Timothy Aelurus in Egypt. He excommunicated two Alexandrine Monophysite sojourners in Constantinople, and opposed "Eutychians" in that capital city.

[2] Evagrius, op. cit., pp. 141-144.

When challenged by monks and bishops of Egypt, being sure of imperial support as he had signed the *Henotikon*, Peter drove out the non-conformist monks from their monasteries. These men now appealed to Zeno, who sent Cosmas to reprove Peter for his harshness. When Cosmas arrived in Alexandria, Zacharias reports that about thirty thousand monks and ten bishops came out to greet the imperial emissary and to submit their grievances against Peter. It was a delicate situation for Peter, who, seeing that the imperial support was not in his favour, went so far as to condemn the Council and the *Tome* openly in the presence of Cosmas and the Egyptians. The Chalcedonian historian Evagrius takes this incident as an evidence of Peter's wavering and double-mindedness. Peter was not a great man. All the same, the delicate situation he was faced with has to be appreciated. From now on Peter made his position clear, namely that he condemned the Council and the *Tome*, but that he stood by the *Henotikon* which, in his judgment, was tantamount to abrogating Chalcedon and its transactions. Even then, only a few of the monks agreed to associate with Peter. The dissentients were strong and even endeavoured to raise a bishop to take the place of Peter. However, they were restrained by Theodore of Antinoe, a bishop whose confidence these monks enjoyed.[1] But, they kept aloof from Peter's fellowship. Since they did not commune with Peter, they came to be designated as the "Acephali"--the headless ones--most probably by their.

---

[1] Zachariah, pp. 134-136. On the authority of Zacharias, and without giving any other reference, Wigram says that "there was talk. . .among these Zealots" of "electing a rival to his [Peter's] throne; but the difficulty of finding a 'really orthodox' prelate brought the scheme to nothing." (*Op. cit.*, p. 46). The first part of this statement is found in Zacharias, which we have mentioned above. But the second part is found in neither Zacharias nor Evagrius. That Peter's role in the incident was not commendable may be granted. But the question regarding the incident is this. According to the *Henotikon*, which we have treated earlier, Peter had every right to condemn the Council and the *Tome* and still strive for unity with Chalcedonians who had not repudiated the Council. However, he took the *Henotikon* as a stepping stone, not to union of the Church, but to recognition of the of the Council. This, so far as we have evidence, was the point of the men who protested against Peter. In other words, Acacius was shrewdly trying to get Chalcedon recognized by its critics and he used Peter as an agent. Though Peter was not smart enough to see that plan, many in his Church saw it, and they opposed him. As for Wigram's theory, the entire Chalcedonian East was divided at that time, as well as the non-Chalcedonian Egypt. Even the insignificant minority of Chalcedonians in Alexandria were not united. For there was a section in that party opposed to John Talaia, and they secured a bishop from Palestine (Wigram, n. on p. 48). Though the non-Chalcedonians in the province of Egypt were divided, they did not have a twofold ministry. Those who disagreed with Peter did not communicate with him. Restrained by a bishop, they did not try to perpetuate their schism.

opponents. Legally their stand was right. We may venture to make a conjecture and say that, had the Chalcedonians been willing to establish peace in the Church on the basis of the Henotikon. Without trying indirectly to confirm the Council of Chalcedon, this movement would have gradually died out. If this conjecture of ours is permissable, the entire failure of the Henotikon to achieve its goal lay with Chalcedonians. In that case, again, it was the insistence on an acceptance of the Council, that divided the Church.

The "Acephalist" movement of Egypt made one point clear to the world. The Christian Egypt was not going to accept the Council of Chalcedon. The emperors recognised this fact, and from now on no one dared to interfere with the religion of that province. As Wigram says, there was, and still is, a section of people in Egypt who remain "unassimilated" with the rest of the people in that land. They are Chalcedonian.[1] In other words, the historic Church of Egypt repudiated the Council of Chalcedon, and it remains to this day in its traditional stand.

Our survey of history thus far has shown that by the close of the fifth century Alexandria, the second major see in Christendom, became confirmed in a non-Chalcedonian theology. A section of the Church in Syria and Palestine was in fellowship with the Egyptian Church. As our purpose in this study is to examine how far they were justified in their anti-Chalcedonian stand, we may make a digression in this context and see Wigram's judgment on them. According to him.

---

[1] Wigram, n. on p. 41

> Insistence at Chalcedon on a phrase ("in two natures") which, however true, was not necessary and not opportune, had irritated all the strong conservative feeling of Egypt and Syria, and myriads who really believed in the reality of the Humanity could, or would, see nothing in the phrase but a denial of the unity of the Person. Behind them was a minority of real Eutychians,[1] who from a false mysticism did not believe in the reality of the Humanity, and who were able to play upon the suspicious fears of the majority. Till this misdirected zeal should have burnt itself out, there was no quenching the fire, and ere that came to pass, Mussulman conquest had put political obstacles in the way of a reconciliation.[2]

In a statement like this Wigram assumes that Chalcedon was primarily concerned about theological principles, and that its critics were unaware of the danger of "Eutychianism." This assumption, as we have seen, is opposed to available facts. There is one point which Wigram ignores. It is very possible that, as an Eastern heresy, "Eutychianism" could find a more congenial home among non-Chalcedonian circles than among Chalcedonian. In the same way, that there were real "Nestorians" in the East cannot be doubted. From the time Zeno closed the school of Edessa in 489 Barsumas and several others fled to Persia and worked for the conversion of the Assyrian Church to their way of thinking. From that time on there was practically no official "Nestorian" Church in the Byzantine empire, though there might have been congregations which venerated Nestorius still. It is very reasonable to think that the non-Chalcedonian objection to the Council was aggravated by the existence of real "Nestorians" among Chalcedonian circles. This plausible conjecture can very well lead a modern scholar to adapt the words of Wigram, and say that "till this misdirected zeal [namely the "Nestorian"] should have burnt itself out, there was no quenching the fire, and ere that came to pass, Mussulman conquest had put political obstacles in the way of a reconciliation."

---

[1] We have seen reference to "Eutychians" in Constantinople in 476 even after twenty-five years of Chalcedonian supremacy. This means that all "Eutychians" in the East had not broken away from the non-Chalcedonian section of the Church. It was rather an Eastern heresy which would, in any case, have offered a resistance to the Church

[2] *Op. cit.*, p. 47.

The truth is that each side had a fear that the other was leaning towards heresy. However, the actual split was not the result of this fear; it was in consequence of personal assertions and national rivalries. These factors counted with Nestorius and Cyril, Leo and Dioscorus, Chalcedonians and non-Chalcedonians.

Immediately after analysing the religious situation at the close of the fifth century in the words quoted above, Wigram goes on to say on the same page of his book:

> Meantime, Rome, as in the great Arian struggle, was clinging fast to principle, and to the *fait accompli*. . . . .
>
> It is gratifying to find, in this whirl of heresies, one see, the holders of which acted --almost without exception--upon principle, and all praise is due to them for their steadfastness.

In the Arian struggle the only see in Christendom which remained unswervingly loyal to Nicea was not Rome, but Alexandria. In the former, there was a bishop in the person of Liberius to sign a document flexible enough to satisfy the Arian emperor Constantius and obtain release from exile. Even Hosius of Cordova, who had most probably been instrumental in getting the expression "homoousios" inserted into the Creed of the Church, made his submission. In that situation it was Athanasius of Alexandria who fought *contra mundum* for the Nicene orthodoxy and even for the expression "homoousios." The fault about the age of Chalcedon was that in it neither party had really inherited the spirit of that great soul. As for Rome, the Council of Chalcedon was the place of her lasting victory. Leo's successors, in frowning at the non-Chalcedonians and opposing the *Henotikon*, ably safeguarded what he had achieved for their see. We do not see in it any clinging fast to principle.

Speaking of principle, we can see more of it on the non-Chalcedonian side. Its adherents had a theological conviction. In spite of political opposition and disabilities of all kinds verging on persecution, they testified to what they believed. We can say that they were one-sided. But the fact is that Chalcedonians were equally one-sided.

Chapter Five

THE LIFE AND WORK OF SEVERUS

The *Henotikon* may be regarded as a land-mark in the history of the Christological controversy. Though it did not achieve the goal of unifying the two parties, its theology was acceptable to both. That it did not bring peace to the Church was because the Chalcedonian party wanted an unequivocal recognition of the Council, which it did not guarantee; and because the non-Chalcedonian party insisted on an open anathema on the Council, which it did not contain. Its theology was Alexandrine orthodoxy short of its characteristic phrases, and it affected the theological developments on both sides. Thus Chalcedonians came to accept the third letter of Cyril to Nestorius, and the non-Chalcedonians started condemning Eutyches by name. This necessitated a new theological development on the Chalcedonian side, which was undertaken by the Scythian monks, who interpreted the Council's Definition along the lines of the Cyrilline tradition. In their efforts, these neo-Cyrillines sanctioned the Alexandrine phrases, "of two natures," "one incarnate nature" and "one composite nature." Contemporaneous with this movement the non-Chalcedonian side also developed its theological position taking more and more into consideration Chalcedonian criticisms against them. The ablest theologian on that side who addressed himself to this task was Severus of Antioch.

Born, according to his biographers, of Christian parents belonging to the city of Sozopolis in Pisidia, he was educated as a lawyer in Alexandria and Berytus. We have his three biographies,[1] all of which speak of him as the grandson of a bishop Severus, who had attended the Council of Ephesus in 431.[2] If we take the information contained in the biographies, we can say that, though born of Christian parents, Severus had not made a commitment to the Christian Faith early in life.

---

[1] The biographies are, *Life of Severus* by Zachariah, another life by John of Aphthynia, and *the Conflict of Severus* by *Athanasius*. The first two are published in *Patrologia Orientalis*, II, and the third in I.

[2] According to Wigram, he was born of an old pagan family. It is, he says, "neither improbable nor discreditable that a powerful mind should fairly weigh the whole matter before deciding, and face the question whether 'the old Faith' could or could not satisfy its yearning" (*op. cit.*, pp. 57-58). Having granted the latter statement, we still have to ask on what evidence we should set aside the testimony of his biographers. That they are drawing an idealised picture of their hero has to be granted. There are two grounds on which Wigram's judgment may be substantiated. (a) His biographers admit that he received Baptism only at the close of his educational career. (b) His Chalcedonian critics slandered his name by using epithets like "magician," "heathen," "devil-worshipper," and so on. In regard to the first, his biographers, apparently endeavouring to answer Chalcedonian criticism, make it clear that his Baptism was delayed in accordance with a prevailing custom in his country in those days of

When once it was made, he received Baptism and took to the monastic way of life, giving up a promising career as a lawyer. As a monk, he started his life in a community in Graza in Palestine around the year 488. That community was divided, some accepting the Council of Chalcedon and others rejecting it. Belonging to the latter by conviction, Severus happened to engage himself in debate with Nephalius, a leading figure in the community.[1] The

---

administering it to persons of mature age except in cases of emergency. If this was true, it could very well be enough ground for Chalcedonian caricature.

[1] According to Wigram, Severus "became a close friend of Peter the Iberian, mentioned above, and adopted the extremest form of Monophysitism, rejecting even the Henotikon. He anathematised Peter Mongus for accepting this document, which he called (with some justice) the 'Diaeriticon' or Divider, and thus became connected with the Acephalist party" (op. cit., p. 58). (Peter the Iberian was the son of the ruler of a small state near the Caucasus. He was sent to Constantinople as a hostage. Later he became a monk in Palestine and after Chalcedon expressed his sympathy with its critics. Consecrated bishop by Theodosius of Jerusalem, the rival of Juvenal, he was one of the officiating bishops at the consecration of Timothy Aelurus.)

Wigram's statement is a jumble of confusions. We have already treated the "Acephalist" party in Egypt. They were not Monophysites of any description, and their objection to Peter Mongus was not an opposition to the theology of the Henotikon. The point of their criticism of Peter was always maintained by Severus. So in his letters to Hippocrates and Dioscorus (Patrologia Orientalis, XII, pp. 316-326), written either in the days of his episcopacy in Antioch or after his expulsion from there, he makes it first theological work of Severus that has come down to us constitutes a treatise against Nephalius. The debate of Severus with Nephalius had far-reaching consequence; for it led the till then unknown monk to a position of leadership in his section of the Church. A staunch Chalcedonian, Nephalius undertook to eject monks of the non-Chalcedonian way of thinking from the community of Gaza. Now these monks got together and delegated Severus to place their grievances before emperor Anastasius. This was the occasion of his visit to Constantinople about the year 500.

He had already mastered the works of earlier theologians of the Church as well as of heretics. It must be remembered that in those days there were many spurious writings ascribed to Church fathers, and that both sides were uncritically regarding them as genuine works of the

---

clear that for peace in the Church a mere acceptance of the Henotikon was not enough, but that an open anathema on the Council and the Tome of Leo was necessary.

Peter the Iberian was not a Monophysite. He was consecrated by Theodosius of Jerusalem who had as early as 453 or 454, refuted "Eutychianists" and John the Rhetorician, and one of the consecrators of Timothy Aelurus who effectively opposed "Eutychianists." If he were a Monophysite, the followers of neither Theodosius nor Timothy would have held him in high esteem.

As for Peter Mongus, we have seen that the role he played was one which neither the Chalcedonian nor the non-Chalcedonian party could approve. The former's view of him is based on their grievance that he did not remain consistent in his acceptance of the Council which he once made. The latter, on the other hand, criticised him for that acceptance.

fathers. Severus had studied all the available works of earlier theologians whether genuine or spurious. His biographers, who are lost in admiration of his person and scholarship, go so far as to say that his Chalcedonian opponents were afraid of facing him in debate on account of the depth of his scholarship as well as his intellectual attainment. Behind this idealisation of their hero, there certainly lies some amount of truth, which may be substantiated by his work, the Philalethes.

It was a work intended to show that Chalcedon had deviated from the teaching of Cyril.[1] As John of Aphthynia testifies,[2] Chalcedonians had collected excerpts from the writings of Cyril, and, subjoining appropriate ones to each clause in the Council's Definition, they tried to make out that the Alexandrine theologian had already anticipated Chalcedon. Hoping to win him over to support the Council, Macedonius of Constantinople handed the work to emperor Anastasius. Without making any judgment about it himself, Anastasius delivered the work to Severus. Having examined the excerpts themselves critically and furnishing more quotations from the writings of Cyril, Severus published a refutation of this Chalcedonian treatise.

---

[1] Wigram's characterisation of this work as a "defence of the memory of Cyril against an accusation of Eutychianism" (op. cit., p. 59. n.) is a clear mistake. See below pp.

[2] Patrologia Orientalis, II, p. 235.

As one of the major works of Severus, the Philalethes will find mention later in this study.

Emperor Anastasius who had succeeded Zeno in 491 followed the religious policy of the latter. By theological preferment he was more inclined to the non-Chalcedonian position than Zeno. Naturally he admired Severus both as a man of piety and as a theological scholar of uncommon ability. In expelling Macedonius of Constantinople, an adherent of Chalcedon, and installing Timothy in that see, Anastasius might well have been influenced by Severus. Behind this step Severus had a plan.

We have noted that, in the days of Acacius, the sees of Alexandria, Antioch, Constantinople and Jerusalem had expressed unity of Faith by accepting the Henotikon and by exchanging letters of doctrinal agreement. However, after the death of Acacius in 489, the see of Constantinople had fallen again into the hands of Chalcedonian primates. Now by the ejection of Macedonius and by the appointment of Timothy the attempt made was to regain the see to the non-Chalcedonian side. A similar attempt was made at Antioch. The province of Syria was miserably divided. Flavian, the incumbent of the see, was at heart a Chalcedonian, but found himself impotent to maintain his conviction in the fact of continued attacks from the critics of the Council under the determined leadership of

Philoxenos of Mabug.[1] Availing themselves of imperial support, the non-Chalcedonians took the initiative in convening a Synod at Sidon, and had Flavian deposed on a charge of heresy. The see thus made vacant was offered to Severus, who, as his biographers say, was persuaded to accept the dignity in 512. The emperor ratified the procedure and Severus resided in Antioch till the death of Anastasius in 518.

In regard to the attempts of the non-Chalcedonians to enlist the support of the major sees, one observation may be made in this context. As we have already noted, Chalcedonians had no ground for apprehension that the see of Constantinople would fall into the hands of the Council's critics. The majority under that see's jurisdiction were in favour of Chalcedon. The Eutychian controversy, in fact, expressed itself in a conflict between Alexandria and Constantinople. The Council of 449 had, in effect, humiliated the latter, and the men who did it were in sympathy with the theological position of the former. Chalcedon reversed the decision of 449.and restored to the see of Constantinople its prestige. So for Constantinople to give up Chalcedon was to give up its place of honour.

---

[1] One of the ablest theologians of the non-Chalcedonian section, Philoxenos has left behind him a major theological work on the doctrine of the Trinity and the Incarnation, which has come down to us in the Syriac original.

To add to that, Chalcedon had, by the 28th canon, raised the Byzantine see to the same level of supremacy in the East as that of Rome in the West. Naturally Constantinople would cling to the Council of Chalcedon as Rome would to the theory of St. Peter's succession. The non-Chalcedonians, on the contrary, had no reason to fear that Alexandria would fall into the hands of Chalcedonians. No Alexandrine could or would forget the treatment rendered to Dioscorus by the Council of 451. At the same time each side tried to capture the incumbents of the two sees, in order to make out that it was exclusively the Church.[1] The state was also in favour of enforced unity. In the struggle for capturing the major sees, both sides ignored the fundamental truth that the hierarchy did not constitute the Church apart from congregations. In other words, the conception of the nature of the Church maintained by both parties in those days was faulty. We shall see more of its implications in our delineation of history.

When Severus became bishop of Antioch he undertook to unify the major sees in the East. His first act in this direction was to try to unite the minor sees under the jurisdiction of Antioch. So a Council of Orientals met at Tyre. The account of this Council preserved by Zacharias of Mitylene, is relevant to our purpose. According to him, the Council consisted of bishops belonging to the districts of Antioch, Apamea, Euphratesia, Osrhoene, Mesopotamia, Arabia and Phoenicia Libani. The chief man at the Council was Severus.

---

[1] The appointment of a Chalcedonian bishop in Alexandria, where no one except a handful of Greek-speaking people who to this day remain unassimilated with the native Christians, was a clear case of Chalcedonian endeavour to make out that that see accepted the Council. (See Wigram, _op. cit._, n. p. 41).

> Making the true faith clear, he expounded the Henotikon of Zeno as meaning the abrogation of the transactions of Chalcedon;[1] and he openly there anathematised the addition which it (the Council of Chalcedon) had made to the faith. And the bishops in Council assembled along with Severus and Akhsnoyo,[2] the believers and doctors who zealously stood at their head, and proclaimed the whole truth; and they wrote letters of agreement both to John of Alexandria,[3] and to Timothy of the royal city. Elijah of Jerusalem[4] also assented to the letters at that time, although shortly after he was ejected, and was succeeded by John. Consequently the priests were again united in their concord of the faith, with the exception of the see of Rome.[5]

This account brings out the point which we are trying to make, namely that Severus and the men on his side were endeavouring to unify the Church on a hierarchical level. They thought that, with the imperial support which they enjoyed, if the bishops could be united, the result would be union for the Church. In this attempt they ignored the Christian truth that the Church cannot be taken simply as a body of bishops. This error was true of both sides, and we shall have occasion at a later stage in this chapter to dwell on the Chalcedonian adherence to it.

---

[1] This clearly shows Severus' attitude towards the Henotikon. He accepted its theology. In fact, the "Acephalists" of Alexandria had not gone beyond this position.

[2] This is another name for Philoxenos of Mabug.

[3] John of Alexandria was the second successor of Peter Mongus.

[4] Elijah was the second successor of Martyrius of Jerusalem.

[5] Zacharias, op. cit., p. 184.

The success of the Council of Tyre was short-lived. Had there been a few more decades of imperial support in favour of Severus and his section of the Church, the dream of the non-Chalcedonians would probably have materialized. That, however, was not forthcoming, and the Council of Tyre, like the Council of Ephesus in 476 during the brief reign of Basiliscus, provided only a breathing space for the non-Chalcedonians to define their theological position more clearly in opposition to the Council of 451.

The non-Chalcedonian position was ably defended by Severus. He had already published his *Ad Nephalium* and the *Philalethes*. Zacharias of Mitylene says that he had also solved seven questions of the Dyophysites.[1] Whether his treatment of these questions was a published work, and if it was, what happened to it, are unknown. His most important theological work was Contra Grammaticum. Regarding the treatise, Zacharias writes:

---

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 180.

> And because Sergius,[1] a grammarian there, composed shortly afterwards [that is, after the Council of Tyre] a book of censure upon the Synod [of Tyre] and gave it to the monks of Palestine who were of his way of thinking, this holy Severus, hearing about it, wrote a refutation of it at great length, and by quotations and proofs derived from the true doctors of the Church he confirmed his doctrine in three volumes, entitled, Against the Grammarian.[2]

Severus started working on the treatise during his days in Antioch, but it was completed only in the course of his life in hiding subsequent to 518.[3]

Anastasius died in 518, and was succeeded by Justin who favoured the Chalcedonian party. Justin's first act was an effort to restore the Church to that party, and in order to achieve the goal he ordered the expulsion of the critics of Chalcedon. The most eloquent opponent of the Council, Severus, was sentenced appropriately to have his tongue cut off.[4] He was, however, unfair to the royal majesty in not letting him enjoy that pleasure, and withdrew from the city.

---

[1] Modern editors speak of "John the Grammarian," without making clear the source of this name.

[2] Op. cit., p. 180.

[3] See Preface to Contra Grammaticum (Syriac), I, p. 12.

[4] Zacharias, pp. 190-191.

A passage in the work of Zacharias will bring out the nature of the treatment meted out by Justin to men of the non-Chalcedonian side.

> Now the bishops of the East, and especially those in the jurisdiction of the learned Severus, some were banished, and others withdrew to Alexandria and various other counties, walking in the footsteps of the chief priest, Severus the doctor. And Akhs'noyo of Hierapolis /Philoxenos of Mabug/ had been sent into exile at Gangra; and he was imprisoned over the kitchen in the hospital there, and was suffocated by smoke, as he states in his epistle; and at last he died. And Antoninus of Berrhoea, and Thomas of Damascus, and Thomas of Dara, and John of Constantia, and Thomas of Anvin, and Peter of Rhesaina, and Constantine of Laodicia, and Peter of Apamea, and others withdrew, and lived in hiding wherever it was convenient for them. But the see of Alexandria had not been disturbed, and Timothy succeeded Dioscorus;[1] and he did not withdraw nor accept the Synod in the days of Justin; and the fugitive believing priests who sought refuge with him he received affectionately, and honoured and encouraged them.[2]

The imperial policy was to deprive the non-Chalcedonian masses in the Orient of ecclesiastical leaders. However, determined non-Chalcedonian congregations braved the disabilities and remained loyal to their spiritual leaders who were far removed from them either as exiles or as refugees. Their plight was the same as that of the Church in the Roman empire prior to the edict of Milan.

---

[1] John, the second successor of Peter Mongus, was succeeded, by another John. This Dioscorus was the latter's successor.

[2] _Op. cit._, pp. 207-208.

The acceptance of the Council of Chalcedon was the only legal guarantee for state protection ever since 451. The Henotikon of Zeno had not actually sanctioned a legal right of existence for the non-Chalcedonian section. Since the latter asserted their position and since large numbers of people in the East were in sympathy with them, the Henotikon had endeavoured to come to terms with them. Now Justin abrogated that concession. In fact, the policy of Justin continued to be maintained by all Byzantine emperors with more or less severity till the Arab conquest of the Middle East. Meanwhile, Chalcedonians, under the patronage of the state, characterised themselves as the one official Church.

Having escaped from Antioch, Severus crossed over to Egypt, where he spent the rest of his life, defending the theological position of his section of the Church, with the exception of a brief period when he visited Constantinople in response to repeated requests from Justinian. Before entering into a treatment of that event, we have to discuss another very important work of his, namely his refutation of Julian of Halicarnassus.

Julian was a bishop on the side of the non-Chalcedonian section of the Church. A friend of Severus, he opposed the Council of Chalcedon and held fast to the phrase: μία φύσις -- σεσαρκωμένη. However, his teaching which came to be condemned was not derived from that non-Chalcedonian phrase.[1] Zacharias of Mitylene says that Julian was one of the bishops who, in the reign of Justin, had withdrawn from their sees, and that he was an old man zealous in the faith.[2]

The history of the work of Severus against Julian needs a brief treatment in this context. According to both the Chalcedonian and the non-Chalcedonian sections, there was in Jesus Christ a union of Godhead and manhood. For both, the manhood was the same as ours. Our manhood is subject to suffering and death. Was, then, the manhood of Christ subject to these infirmities? This was the point to which Julian addressed himself. As Julian writes to Severus,[3] "certain men," on the strength of Cyril's writings, answered this question in the affirmative. The bishop of Halicarnassus himself refers to three passages in support of their position.[4] (a) In his letter to Succensus of Diocaesarea Cyril wrote, "After the Resurrection it was the body which had suffered, though it no longer supported human infirmities but was incorruptible."[1] (b) Cyril wrote to Theodosius the emperor, "It is a marvel and a miracle that a body naturally subject to corruption rose without corruption."[2] (c) In his sixty-seventh treatise dealing with the Holy Virgin the Theotokos, Cyril wrote: "The body of our Lord was in no way subjected to the sin which belongs to corruption, but was susceptible of death and of true burial, and He destroyed them in it."[3]

---

[1] In the Chalcedonian party also there were men who held the tenets of Julian (Sellers, _op. cit._, pp. 310-311).

[2] _Op. cit._, p. 232.

[3] Zacharias, _op. cit._, p. 234.

[4] _Ibid._, pp. 234-235.

Cyril's affirmation in these passages is based on the Pauline distinction between the "natural" body and the "spiritual" body.[4] The resurrection body for Paul is spiritual and as such incorruptible. The same distinction is applicable for Cyril to Christ's body. Before the resurrection His body was susceptible of death and decay; but after the resurrection it was not subject to corruption. Between Christ's body before the resurrection and our body there is one distinction. Whereas His was untouched by sin which belongs to corruption, our is subject even to sin. In other words, Cyril upheld the affirmation that our Lord was absolutely sinless, though His body could suffer pain and death. This Cyrilline idea may be compared to the teaching of Augustine who had maintained that, in His earthly life, Jesus Christ had _non posse peccare_ over against the gift of _posse non peccare_ which the elect receive by divine grace.

---

[1] PG, LXXVII, p. 236.

[2] De Rect. Fid. ad Theod. Imp., p. 22.

[3] This passage could not be traced.

[4] I Cor. 15.

Julian objected to the attribution of corruptibility to the body of our Lord before the resurrection.[1] Taking the passages produced from Cyril as an "error in writing," he wrote a book, trying to make out that Christ's body both before and after the resurrection was incorruptible.[1] He sent the book to Severus for approval by the learned theologian.[2] Julian obviously believed that his point of view was orthodox, and hoped that Severus would unhesitatingly agree with him. However, the reaction his work produced in Severus was contrary to Julian's expectations.

---

[1] On the authority of Draguet, Sellers says that Julian had not taught the confusion of the natures of Christ, and that he was as orthodox as Severus (_op. cit._, pp. 309-310, n. 6).

The amazing thing about the appraisal of the non-Chalcedonian position made by Chalcedonian scholars both ancient and modern including Sellers is that they have shown willingness to try and bring out the exact teachings of men whom no section of the Church has actually venerated for any length of time; but in regard to an ecclesiastical tradition which has existed in history to our times and which claims to have answered all Chalcedonian criticisms against it no one seems to have bothered to know what exactly has been its theological emphasis. That it maintained a doctrine of the "confusion of the natures" is a charge which goes back to the days of Cyril of Alexandria. From that time on, the charge has been answered. Severus of Antioch, in fact, laughs to scorn this fantastic charge, which for him reflects only the capacity of his opponents to understand ideas. (_Contra Grammaticum_, Syriac version, I, pp. 12-54). Even the possibility of portraying the theological position of his section of the Church as "Monophysite" was excluded by him (See below pp. 363f.). However, Chalcedon itself exonerated Cyril who, according to Theodoret and the Antiochenes, was the teacher of "confusion." Even since 451 Cyril was a saint even to Theodoret, but those who upheld Cyril's theological position came to be characterised as teachers of "confusion." Where, then, did "confusion" lie? As we shall see later, it lay not in the theology of Cyril and his real successors, but in the minds of their opponents.

As is clear from the letters of Severus to Julian, the former was led by two considerations. On the one hand, he did not want to expose his friend as a heretic; and on the other, heretical as his tenets were, Severus was concerned not to let his section of the Church be blamed for them. With these considerations in mind, Severus put off the matter for some time. In the meantime, Julian became impatient and went so far as to publish the work, despite the fact that Severus had made his dissent from it very clear. It was in this context that Severus published his work against Julian. This treatise also will come to our notice in the next part of this study.

In 527 Justin died leaving his nephew Justinian to continue his policy of enforcing Chalcedon on the Church in the East. Ambitious and cocksure of himself as a theologian par excellence, this monarch came to realise that the non-Chalcedonian masses in Egypt, Palestine, Syria and other parts of the East would at any time be a danger to the unity of his empire; and addressed himself to work for the reunion of the two parties. However, his scheme for achieveng the goal was different from that of Zeno and Anastasius. Whereas the latter two monarchs had been willing even to ignore Chalcedon for the sake of reunion, Justinian tried to persuade the non-Chalcedonians to accept the Council by interpreting its formula in a way which would comprehend their theological emphasis. From 531 Justinian carried on a series of attempts in this direction.

---

[1] This position of Julian is fatal to the theory that for him incorruptibility meant only impeccability. In fact, impeccability was granted by Severus. Why, then, did Julian persist in his views?

[2] Julian's first correspondence to Severus was a covering letter dispatched along with the book.

As we have noted elsewhere, ever since Chalcedon its opponents had been beyond the bounds of legal protection by the state. The _Henotikon_ had not, in fact, recognised them as a religious group within the Byzantine empire. From the death of Anastasius in 518 even the _Henotikon_ had been repealed, and the acceptance of Chalcedon was the only guarantee for legal aid to Churchmen. Now in 531 Justinian ordered the bishops who had been either in exile or in hiding places to appear before him in Constantinople. Obviously Justinian was not afraid so much of these bishops, but of non-Chalcedonian masses who would look only to them for guidance. Having invited the leaders of the non-Chalcedonian party, Justinian sent a special communication to Severus requesting his presence. He, however, did not comply; instead he sent a reply, which will engage our attention in a moment. The bishops who obeyed the summons presented to the emperor a confession of the Faith, most of which is preserved by Zacharias.[1] They affirmed the Trinitarian doctrine and proceeded:

> One of the Persons of this holy Trinity, that is God the Word, we say, by the will of God the Father, in the last days, for the salvation of men, took flesh of the Holy Spirit and of the Holy Virgin the Theotokos Mary in a body endowed with a rational and intellectual soul, passible after our nature, and became man, and was not changed from that which He was. And so we confess that, while in the Godhead He was of the same nature of the Father, He was also of our nature in the manhood. Accordingly He who is perfect Word, the invariable Son of God, became perfect man, and left nothing wanting for us in respect of our salvation, as the foolish Apollinarians said.
>
> . . . .
>
> For, if our intellect was not united with Him, as he absurdly says, then we are not saved, and in the matter of salvation have fallen short of that which is of the highest consequence for us. . . . God the Word truly became incarnate, in truth again, and not in semblance, with natural and innocent passions, among the things which He took upon Himself in the passible flesh of our nature of His own will endured also our death, which He made life for us by a Resurrection befitting God, for He first restored incorruption and immortality to human nature.
>
> And, indeed, as God the Word left nothing wanting and was not phantasmal in the Incarnation and Humanisation, so He did not divide it into two persons and two natures according to the doctrine introduced by Nestorius the man-worshipper and those who formerly thought like him, and those who in our day so think.

---

[1] *Op. cit.*, pp. 246-252.

As for the Council of Chalcedon, the bishops argue that both in its Definition and in the Tome of Leo, the Council contradicted the tradition of the Church as explicated by the Councils of Nicea, Constantinople and Ephesus. In the light of that tradition, Chalcedon stands condemned. Therefore, it is not they who anathematise Chalcedon, but the fathers who had sat in the three earlier Councils.

The argument of these bishops is clear enough. The truth to be remembered is that they were not individual leaders who opposed the Council every one in his own way. On the contrary, they were Eastern churchmen who upheld the tradition of the Church as defined by earlier authoritative Councils. In their judgment, Dioscorus and all the men recognised by their section of the Church remained loyal to that tradition. The Chalcedonian phrase "in two natures," in their view, was opposed to that tradition, and on that plea they repudiated the Council. Therefore, the crucial question is this. Did they keep out all known heresies, and did they conserve all positive affirmations of the Faith? Insofar as we have evidence, not one of the non-Chalcedonian leaders including Dioscorus has ever been challenged on these specific points. But ideas have been read into them, which they had unequivocally repudiated. The fact, therefore, is that, ever since Chalcedon, those who adhered to the Council have tried to make out that its *Definition* was exclusively orthodox. At the same time, there continued to exist in history an ecclesiastical tradition, which, while condemning Chalcedon, remained loyal to the historic Faith of the undivided Church.

What, then, did Chalcedon actually achieve? Why were the men opposed to it treated as outlaws and deemed unworthy even to live as free citizens in the Byzantine empire? How can the successors of their persecutors claim to belong to an "undivided Church" in history? These are significant questions to be asked and answered before any appraisal of the Council of Chalcedon is made. However, even the best in Western scholarship to which the present writer has had occasion to refer is not interested in these questions.[1] We may illustrate this point by referring to a statement of Wigram regarding the *Collatio* of 531 at which the non-Chalcedonian bishops presented their *Confession of Faith*.

---

[1] With all apologies to Wigram, one has to say that his theory regarding the non-Chalcedonian position is based on confusion. His thesis may be summarised in this way. Though Chalcedon was untimely and even unnecessary in its day, it was orthodoxy; those who opposed the Council came to be divided into many sects; and of all these, the "Severian sect" alone was nearer to orthodoxy than the others. (See *op. cit.*, pp. 11-12, and Chapter XI on the *Divisions of the Monophysites*). He sheds tears at the unreasonable stand of this "sect" in deciding to keep outside the Church. We have already treated some of the facts connected with Wigram's "divisions of the Monophysites" (above pp. 234f.). The question which Wigram does not pause to answer is this. If, as he admits, Chalcedon was untimely, and if its critics excluded every known heresy and conserved all theological principles, how can they be blamed for Leo's decision to enforce "in two natures" on

"The Monophysites," writes Wigram, "were compelled to admit that 'the second Council of Ephesus' (the Latrocinium) had really needed revision at Chalcedon, not on account of any murders committed there, but because it had acquitted Eutyches, whom all of his party had now thrown overboard as an ecclesiastical Johah."[1] As we have seen, there was no evidence for condemning Eutyches as a heretic, and the non-Chalcedonian party had not condemned him by name till 476. The *Henotikon* anathematised him, because there was a theological position in the East in both Chalcedonian and non-Chalcedonian circles which comprehended only the notions ascribed to the old monk.[2] Therefore, the second Council of Ephesus had not erred in condoning Eutyches. In regard to Chalcedon, on the contrary, the second Council of Constantinople in 553, regarded by

---

the Church? How can Leo and his Eastern partisans be regarded as constituting the Church? Wigram's reference to A. A. Luce's work on *Monophysitism Past and Present* as a "valuable essay" (*op. cit.*, n. p.147), if it is meant to deprecate the non-Chalcedonian position, is unforgiveable. This work is the creation of the author's imagination.

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 114.

[2] Wigram himself admits that Eutyches was not the leader of the "Eutychianist" teachers (*op. cit.*, p. 30, n.)

Chalcedonians as the fifth ecumenical Council, implicitly admitted several flaws. (a) For the Council of 553 accepted Cyril's third letter to Nestorius with the anathematisms as authoritative. (b) It sanctioned the Alexandrine phrase μία φύσις. (c) It condemned the anti-Cyrilline works of Theodoret and Ibas.

This inconvenient phase of Chalcedonian history is denounced by Wigram as an error of the Council of 553.[1] If the Council of 553 erred, there is no apriori reason why that of 451 had not. Folks who invoke the authority of the Ephesian Council of 431, which accepted Cyril's third letter as orthodox, can very well see a disjunction between it and the Council of Chalcedon which ignored that document.[2] It was this inconsistency that the Council of 553 endeavoured to rectify. Therefore, for the sake of consistency, those who reject the Council of 553 should leave out the Council of 431 also. Chalcedonians, however, have not to this day abandoned either of these Councils. This means that Chalcedonians in ancient times were more aware of the errors of the Council of 451 than modern exponents of that Council are prepared to admit. At the same time, Rome, Constantinople and the successors of

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 130.

[2] Wigram's view that the Council of 431 had not formally accepted Cyril's third letter (*Ibid*, p. 10) is opposed to facts.

Theodoret of Cyrus in Antioch were determined to cling to the one Council which guaranteed an unprecedented victory for them both politically and theologically.

It is with an understanding of this factual situation that the way Severus treated Justinian's invitation should be viewed. To the first letter of the emperor Severus gave a reply, most of which is preserved for us by Zacharias.[1] This humble but dignified letter starts with an expression of gratitude to the emperor for his invitation promising safe conduct, and goes on to explain the reason why he cannot accept it.

> For I am afraid, lest, if my meanness be openly seen in the royal city, many persons may be alarmed, and though I am in truth nothing but merely a vile person bound under this heavy yoke of sins, when they hear of this, many persons may be roused to anger and inflamed by this paltry anxiety as by a little coal of fire, so as to trouble and annoy even your Mightiness owing to your affection towards me: and I think that it will not seem to you fitting nor to others profitable.[2]

Severus, then, goes on to touch on two accusations against him. One, that he distributed money in Alexandria and stirred up tumult among people. Severus answers this incredible charge by pointing out that

---

[1] *Op. cit.*, pp. 254-261.

[2] Zacharias, p. 256. This is the only reason stated in the letter for his refusal to comply with the King's invitation. At the end of the letter the Patriarch requests the emperor in a very moving way not to disturb him in his solitude, old man that he was. Therefore, Wigram, is wrong in saying that Severus "excused himself on the ground of illness" (*op. cit.*, p. 114).

> this very thing is known to those who hate me greatly that, though involved in the passions of other sins, I do not seek hastily to amass money; and this by no light reasons, but my life is habitually frugal, insomuch that not even the renowned bishopric drew me away from this habit.

The other charge against him was that he was oppressive in his dealings with people, and Severus answers it with characteristic boldness. "If some apply the term turbulence to what I wrote against Julian," states Severus, "I do with ten thousand mouths and tongues confess and do not deny what I wrote, even as nobody will hastily order me to deny my faith."

In conclusion, Severus expresses his wish that the Triune God may give peace to the empire and "perfect concord in sound faith" to the holy churches.

Justinian was, however, determined that a serious effort should be made to unify the Church. As the ablest theologian of the non-Chalcedonian section, Severus was the man to be consulted, and the emperor went on writing to him pressing letters inviting him to Constantinople. The empress,[1] a convinced non-Chalcedonian, might very well have influenced Justinian in this direction. In response to repeated requests from the emperor, Severus visited Constantinople and stayed there for a period of eighteen months. Apparently he was not optimistic about the results of his visit.

---

[1] No non-Chalcedonian has suffered so much of injustice at the hands of Chalcedonian historians as this great lady. In the words of the Reverend Theodore M. Riley, "Theodora, his /I.e., Justinian's/ Empress, the actress of former days, dissolute then beyond words to fitly utter,

Epiphanius of Constantinople died after the Collatio of 531 and his place had been filled by Anthimus

---

yet transformed into a woman and an Empress, dutiful to her husband's honour and great position, while yet ruling him with an extent and completeness of management of which history affords few examples" (The Six Oecumenical Councils--The Church Club Lectures for 1893, p. 248). That Theodora was the daughter of one Acacius of Constantinople who died leaving his widow and three daughters; that the widow consorted with someone thereby reducing the children to extreme penury; and that this led Theodora to earn a livelihood by prostitution and theatrical performance, go back to the Secret History of Procopius of Caesarea. The story itself is fantastic. Even granting that Justinian would possibly have married a woman of such low origin and even raised her to the status of the empress, this story is inadequate to explain how she could have supported a religious faction in the empire which her husband had universally outlawed and persecuted. Therefore, even if this were the only story preserved by ancients it should be dismissed as incredible. The fact, however, is that there exists another account of her early life, which will explain her greatness as an empress and her courage of conviction as a devoted Christian. According to the account of the sixth century historian Zacharias of Mitylene as preserved by Michael the Syrian, Theodora was the daughter of a convinced non-Chalcedonian priest in Mabug. During his stay in the East subsequent to his elevation to the dignity of Caesar, Justinian met her and proposed to marry her. But her father would not agree to the match, except on condition that he would respect her religious conviction and loyalty (Michael le Syrien, IV, p. 277).

of Trebizond. Though he was opposed to Chalcedon, it had not become apparent. During his stay in the capital, Severus was able to discover that fact, and they became friends committed to each other in the fellowship of the Faith. Theodosius of Alexandria who was also in Constantinople joined the two men, and a triumvirate was formed. It was a moment of triumph for the non-Chalcedonian cause, and may be compared to the days of Acacius about fifty years earlier or to those of Timothy about twenty-five years before. There was, however, one difference between the two earlier occasions and this one. Whereas on the previous occasions the emperors of those respective periods were ready to support reunion even at the cost of ignoring Chalcedon, this time the emperor wanted only to persuade the non-Chalcedonians to accept the Council's Formula interpreted in a way that would make it possible for them, in the judgment of the king, to accept it. This, in fact, was not a workable scheme. There was, however, one hopeful sign. Though the emperor was Chalcedonian, the empress was unwaveringly non-Chalcedonian. She had set up a monastery in order to offer shelter to Churchmen of her party who happened to take refuge in the city. So in case the negotiations failed, Severus and the men on his side could expect protection. Not only that, Justinian had on oath promised them safe conduct, and he kept his promise.

During the discussions with the emperor, Severus and the men on his side made it clear that they would not accept the Council of Chalcedon. At the same time, enjoying communion with the primate of Constantinople and openly supported by the empress, Severus' stay at the capital for a period of eighteen months naturally could not be appreciated by Chalcedonians in the East. Justinian himself showed respect to the non-Chalcedonian Patriarch, and those who regarded it a service to God to persecute non-Chalcedonians began to be disturbed. Ephraim of Antioch came out to stop the emperor's flirtations with men whom he had marked out for a special treatment in his persecuting programme. For a theological discussion with men like Severus, Ephraim found it hard to nominate any one from the Chalcedonian party. There was only one way open to him to straighten the emperor, and he had recourse to it.

The one thing which Justinian would hesitate to do was to offend the bishop of Rome. Any Chalcedonian at that time held the incumbent of the Western see in high esteem. To add to that, Justinian wanted the favour of the Roman bishop in order to achieve his goal of reconquerring Italy and Africa. Now Ephraim sent an envoy to Rome, requesting Agapetus to visit Constantinople and speak to the emperor. Since the situation seemed to call for exceptional action, Agapetus decided to visit Constantinople. The very sight of Agapetus was enough incentive for Justinian to change his mind. In this was the triumph of Chalcedon remained unchallenged at the cost of the Church's unity from that day to this. One point became clear, namely Chalcedonians would not give up the Council, and non-Chalcedonians would not accept it.

The failure of the Collatio of 531 and of the discussion between Justinian and Severus led the latter to take refuge again in a life of retirement in hiding in 536. Anthimus of Constantinople also followed his example. In their absence a Council of about fifty bishops met in Constantinople in 536 with five Roman legates. [1] It ratified Chalcedon, and Justinian confirmed its decisions by drawing up a new constitution outlawing the non-Chalcedonian section of the Church.

We may reproduce in this context two passages from the work of Evagrius, a sixth century Chalcedonian historian. Dealing with the religious situation in the East in the reign of Anastasius, he writes:

---

[1] These five men might have come to Constantinople in the company of Agapetus and stayed on for the Council after his death.

> During these times, accordingly, the Synod of Chalcedon was neither openly proclaimed in the most holy churches, nor yet was repudiated by all; but the bishops acted each according to his individual opinion. Thus, some very resolutely maintained what had been put forth by that synod, and would not yield to the extent of one word of its determinations, nor admit even the change of a single letter, but firmly declined all contact and communion with those who refused to admit the matters there set forth. Others again, not only did not submit to the Synod of Chalcedon and its determinations, but even anathematised both it and the Tome of Leo. Others, however, firmly adhered to the Henotikon of Zeno, and that too mutually at variance on the point of the single[1] and double nature; some being caught by the artful composition of that document; and others influenced by an inclination for peace. Thus the Churches in general were divided into district factions, and their presidents did not even admit each other to communion.[2]

Till the death of Anastasius in 518 the religions situation in the East was of the kind Evagrius portrays in this passage. One might say that from 451 to 518 there was no united Church in history. The same historian treats the situation subsequent to the Collatio of 536 in these words:

> From that time forward the synod of Chalcedon was openly proclaimed in all the churches, and no one dared to anathematise it, while those who dissented were urged by innumerable methods to assent to it. Accordingly, a new Constitution was drawn

---

[1] We are reproducing here what is found in the English translation of the work of Evagrius. The Alexandrian phrase μία φύσις cannot accurately be rendered

[2] Evagrius: op. cit., p. 158.

> up by Justinian in which he anathematised Severus, Anthimus and others, and subjected those who held their doctrines to the highest penalties; the effect of which was that thenceforward no schism remained in any of the churches, but the Patriarchs of the several dioceses agreed with each other, and the bishops of the cities followed their primates.[1]

It must be remembered that, while dealing with the tumults and massacres in Jerusalem and Alexandria just after Chalcedon, this historian himself has unequivocally stated that the difference between the two sides was merely verbal.[2] By the new Constitution, all church buildings were given over to Chalcedonians, and the non-Chalcedonians were reduced to a state of existence devoid of any right to function as a religious community. In other words, Justinian began to enforce the already established state law against the section of the Church which repudiated Chalcedon. Evagrius is confusing the Church of God in history with the state Church of the Byzantine empire. Any Chalcedonian writer, whether Eastern or Western, who identifies the Church with the Chalcedonian party is helping to perpetuate the confusion made by Evagrius in the sixth century.

---

[1] Op. cit., pp. 200-201.

[2] See above pp. 221-222.

The truth of the matter is that, in spite of the Byzantine state law, non-Chalcedonian masses continued to remain loyal to their spiritual leaders, among whom Severus was the most important theological thinker at that time. As we have seen, neither at Chalcedon nor after it the theological position conserved by Dioscorus and his successors had received any attention from the Chalcedonian party. At Chalcedon the Antiochenes and the Western delegation made certain assertions, and, on the strength of imperial support, they reduced the Church of God in history to their alliance. This could be justified, had they clearly stated the theological error of their opponents. The fact is that they never did this.

We have tried to show the theological position of the men on the non-Chalcedonian side from Dioscorus onwards. Now we shall pass on to a more detailed treatment of the theology of Severus whom the Eastern anti-Chalcedonian section of the Church has venerated as a saint and a theologian of great eminence. He died about two years after the Collatio ~~of~~ 536. In order to study his Christological teaching, we have, in addition to his works already referred to, a large number of letters, some of the Hymns he wrote and the Homilies he preached.

Part Two

The Christology of Severus of Antioch

Chapter One

The Use of Crucial Terms

Our survey of the controversy between the Chalcedonian and the non-Chalcedonian parties in the Church has shown that the latter objected to the phrase "in two natures" or "two natures after the union" on which the former insisted. In order to understand the point of objection of these phrases, the meaning of the term "nature" is crucial. Along with this term, there were three others which were also very fundamental. We shall bring out the sense in which Severus has defined them. Of the four terms--ousia, hypostasis, physis and prosopon--we shall take up the first two together.

In his letter to Eusebius, the scholastic, Severus gives his definition of these two terms briefly. "*Ousia*," he writes, "signifies that which is common, and *hypostasis* that which is particular".[1] He treats the subject more fully in his work against Sergius the Grammarian.[1] Since the Grammarian had prefixed a discussion on terms in his book, Severus says that he is also constrained to adopt the same method.

---

[1] *Patrologia Orientalis*, XII, p. 195.

Following Athanasius, he treats the term "ousia" as signifying that which IS.[2] In the book of Exodus a voice is reported to have come from God to Moses, saying, "I am He Who IS; and tell the children of Israel that He Who IS has sent me." John, the Evangelist, writes in the Gospel regarding the Son, "In the beginning was the Word," and in the Epistle, "He Who IS, and He Who Was, and He Who is to Come." This, says Severus, forms part of the Scriptural testimony to the term "ousia." "The inspired doctors of the Church" have defined that "One is the ousia of the holy and transcendent Trinity." "If the Father IS, and the Son IS, and the Holy Spirit IS, it is the same for them TO BE and to be of the same honour and eternity. It is obvious, therefore, that the word "ousia" is derived from that which IS."[3]

---

[1] For the historical context in which Severus wrote his Contra Grammaticum, see above p. 255. It was, as we have seen, a work published in answer to Sergius, the Grammarian who had written a refutation of the non-Chalcedonian position subsequent to the Council of Tyre.

[2] Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, second series, IV, pp. 165 and 469.

[3] Contra Grammaticum, (Syriac) I; p. 56.

Having defined the terms in this way, he proceeds to illustrate the point. "The term 'man' signifies the race and the common belonging to the entire human nature."[1] As Scriptural reference to this position, Severus says that in one place in the book of Genesis God spoke to Noah and his sons: "the blood of him that sheds man's blood will be spilt in his behalf, because in the image of God I have made man." Here the reference is not, argues Severus, to a particular man, but the word "man" refers to the entire race.[2] On the other hand, if "we name a particular man, say Job or Elkanah," "we regard him as one belonging to the ousia and race of the common humanity."[3] Both Job and Elkanah are men. As hypostases, however, they are two, because each of them received his concrete existence "separately and specifically."

The author then goes on to apply the principle behind the definition in expounding the orthodox conception of God.

> The name "God," he writes, is common for the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. Just as the Father is God beyond time and eternally, the Son is God and the Holy Spirit

---

[1] Contra Grammaticum, op. cit., p. 62.

[2] Ibid., p. 58. Severus is here open to serious criticism. For the word "man" in the context does not refer to either ousia or the race, but to "any man."

[3] Ibid., p. 59.

> is God beyond time and eternally. The Father never began TO BE, for He always IS; in the same way the Son IS and the Holy Spirit IS.[1]

From the point of view of ousia, there is no difference whatsoever between any two of them. Neither is one of them greater or lesser than either of the other two. All the three are co-eternal and co-equal.

In regard to hypostasis, the Father is one, the Son is another, and the Holy Spirit is yet another. This distinction consists in being unbegotten in the case of the Father, being begotten of the Father in the case of the Son, and proceeding from the Father in that of the Holy Spirit.[2] In support of his exposition, Severus quotes from the writing of Basil to Ampholicus.

Between the Severian definition of terms and his illustrations we can note a disjunction. In defining "ousia," for instance, he says that it means the being of anything. When, however, it comes to illustrations, he goes beyond this statement and asserts that it is a common name for all the members of a class. This disjunction between definition and illustrations has some serious consequences. Anticipating what we have to treat later, we may point out that he employs the principle lying behind the definition of terms in dealing with man as a body-soul entity and the character of Christ's manhood.[1] But in answering the Grammarian's claim that the term "nature" in the Chalcedonian Formula meant ousia, he takes up his stand on the principle behind his illustrations.[2]

---

[1] Contra Grammaticum, op. cit., p. 62.

[2] See below pp. 386f.

The idea implied in the definition of the term "ousia" may be explained in this way. Ousia is real, or we may say that it refers to the IS-ness or being of anything. It does not, however, have a concrete existence; for everything that exists concretely is a particular. Ousia is, so to say, the reality, which, when individuated, gives rise to particular objects. Hypostasis is the same reality when it has received a concrete existence. Humanity, for instance, as ousia, is the metaphysical ground, as it were, which is individuated in particular human beings. We can perceive each one of them and distinguish them one from another. That every human being is called "man" is because in its entirety humanity has become individuated in him.

So far as this exposition goes, we can find a continuity between it and the position which the Cappadocian fathers had maintained. But in his illustrations, the emphasis is different; for in them Severus sees only the idea of the universal. Severus is obviously combining two ideas, without himself being aware of that fact.

---

[1] See below pp. 425f.

[2] See below pp. 425f.

Origenists in theology, the Cappadocians were Platonists. They could identify ousia with the archetype. However, in adopting this metaphysical heritage for expounding the Homoousian doctrine of Nicea, they were very careful to avoid the notion that the ousia of Godhead has an existence in itself. So they insisted that the divine ousia is entirely in the Father. In his Transcript of the Faith,[1] Basil treats the Nicene affirmation that the Son is "of the ousia of the Father" and comments that the emphasis here is on the word "ousia". The entire ousia of Godhead is in the Father. In addition to the ousia, He has fatherhood and being unbegotten as signifying His hypostasis. The Son is not born of the latter, but of the former. Basil, therefore, makes a distinction between ousia and hypostasis, though, in regard to Godhead, he does not assign to ousia a status apart from the three hypostases. The Severian definition of the terms can very well accomodate this idea. So in the case of man, the non-Chalcedonian theologian can speak of ousia as dynamic and of every human being as the result of an individuation of the same ousia in its fulness. But if the principle on which he furnishes illustrations and on which he criticises the Grammarian is employed in explaining the affirmation of Basil, it will lead to a position which neither he himself nor the Cappadocian theologian would be willing to grant. For it will be tantamount to saying that the Son is born of the three hypostases in the Triune God together.

---

[1] N. & P. N. F., second series, VIII, Letter CXXV.

The confusion in regard to the use of the term "ousia" which we find in Severus will make clear one point. The Antiochene Patriarch, in spite of his masterful scholarship in Patristic writings, had never received a sufficient grounding in any system of Greek philosophy. In fact, in his third letter to Sergius the Grammarian,[1] he describes Gregory Nazianzen as a man well-versed in the lore of philosophers, but about himself he admits that his knowledge of them is only from hearsay.[2] His attitude to the study of philosophy is also expressed by him in the same letter. In so far as the study of Christian theology is concerned, he says, what is required is to master the writings of the Fathers. In addition to that, if one can devote oneself to study philosophy, it is commendable. Moved by this attitude, Severus has mastered the writings of Church fathers, without however taking the trouble to delve into the metaphysical heritage which those men had made their own. Thus, in his illustrations, he identifies "ousia" with the "universal" of Aristotle--a position which the Athenian philosopher had never assumed.

---

[1] This Sergius the Grammarian should not be confused with the Chalcedonian theologian of the same name, whose work Severus undertook to refute in his _Contra Grammaticum_. The Sergius referred to here wrote to the Patriarch, raising a query on the basis of a Monophysite Christology, and the answers of Severus were a refutation of that way of thinking. For the view of this Sergius and Severus' criticism, see below pp. 367f.

[2] _Ad Nephalium_, (Syriac), pp. 70-187.

We shall now pass on to a discussion of his treatment of the term "physis." In more than one of his writings Severus deals with its meaning. In his letter to Maron, he writes:

> The term "nature" is sometimes taken in place of ousia; sometimes in place of hypostasis. For even the whole mankind we call comprehensively "nature," as it is indeed written: "For all natures of beasts . . . are made subject to human nature"; and again we speak of one nature in respect of a single man, Paul for example or Peter, or may be James. Where therefore we name all mankind one nature, we use the name "nature" generically in place of ousia; but where we say that there is one nature of Paul, the name "nature" is employed in place of hypostasis.[1]

In his work against the Grammarian, Severus treats the term "nature" more fully.

---

[1] Patrologia Orientalis, XII, p. 196.

> The word "nature," he writes, sometimes signifies the common or the general [in the sense of] ousia; and sometimes [in that of] particular and the one that is given, like hypostasis.[1]

In support of this position, he then quotes from the writings of earlier Church fathers. He quotes first from the fourth Tome of Cyril to Nestorius.

> The nature of Godhead is one, which is individuated as the Father, also as the Son, and in the same way as the Holy Spirit.[2]

Again Cyril writes as quoted by Severus:

> The nature of Godhead is known as one in the holy and con-substantial Trinity.

In these passages, says Severus, Cyril testified to the fact that Physis or nature means "ousia and the signification of the common." But, in his letter to the princess, Cyril used the term in the sense of hypostasis, when he wrote:

> We affirm that the Word, the Creator of the worlds, in whom and by whom is everything, the True Light, the Nature that gives life to all, who is His Only Son, was begotten unspeakably from the Ousia of God the Father.

The evidence offered above refers to the term "nature" as applied to God. Severus claims that the

---

[1] Contra Grammaticum, op. cit., p. 68.

[2] Ibid.

the same principle can be employed in speaking of man also. In fact, Cyril has, he says, used it in both senses. Signifying ousia, he employed it in his third Tome against Nestorius and wrote:

> Owing to the trespass of Adam, the nature of man descended into curse and death.[1]

Indicating the sense of hypostasis, he adopted the term in his work against Andrew of Samosata, in which he wrote:

> In regard to the one prosopon and one nature that is hypostasis, when those out of which He is and is naturally composed are thought of, reason brings them together, recognising Him as one in composition, not to be divided into two.

In his definition of the term "nature" Severus admits only these two meanings. Thus, for him, nature means either ousia or hypostasis, according to context. Here again the two strains of ideas which we found in the Severian treatment of the term "ousia" must be borne in mind. Taking the first, namely the one derived from the Cappadocians, we can illustrate the term "nature" in this way. If we speak of the nature of God in the sense of ousia it means Godhead, the one reality concrete eternally in the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. The nature of man in this sense is the reality which when individuated gives rise to particular human beings. In the sense of hypostasis, "nature" is the same reality having come into concrete existence in particular beings.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 70.

In the days of Severus, judging from his writings, his critics on the Chalcedonian side also had not comprehended any other meaning for the term. In his work against the Grammarian Severus quotes a passage from the former's book.

> The Grammarisn: *Ousia* signifies the common. The one Godhead of the holy Trinity, for instance, or [what is common to] us, namely humanity in general. *Hypostasis* refers to the one prosopon of the Father, or of the Son, or of the Holy Spirit; or again of Peter, John or any man. But *nature* is employed sometimes in place of ousia and sometimes in place of hypostasis.[1]

Both Severus and his critic on the Chalcedonian side agree therefore as to the meaning of the term "nature." Between them, however, there is a difference. As we have already noted, for practical purposes of interpretation, Severus identifies "ousia" with the "universal," without assigning to it a status of its own apart from particulars. We shall see later that this error does not enable Severus to make the real point against his critic. The Grammarian, on the other hand, must have taken the term "ousia" in the Cappadocian sense and viewed it as a dynamic principle.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 145.

We have an interesting reference to the meaning of the terms in the letters of the other Sergius the Grammarian, to whom we have already referred.

> For us, he says, the terms nature and ousia are alike. The former is taken in the sense of that which is prone to exist ([illegible]), and the latter in the sense of that which IS.[1]

This correspondent was a student of philosophy and he referred to Aristotle's treatment of ousia making mention of the distinction between primary ousia and secondary ousia. Severus answered Sergius' letter by reproving the writer for not giving sufficient attention to Patristic writings, according to which "nature" meant either ousia or hypostasis.

The correspondence between the two men is an evidence of the fact that the terms had not come to be taken in any uniform sense by people who were using them even early in the sixth century. However, the intellectual atmosphere was becoming ready for the work of Leontius in another two decades to fix the Aristotelian meaning on the term "nature."

The treatment of the terms by both Severus and his Chalcedonian critic leaves us with the significant question, whether the term "nature" meant only either ousia or hypostasis. In the Severian writings we do not find a clue to a third meaning, though in many places he himself employs the terms ousia, hypostasis, physis and prosopon together. One point, however, is clear. Chalcedonians were determined somehow to defend the Council, and they were trying to fix a meaning of the term to suit their purpose. Thus their idea was to confirm the Council rather than to unify the Church. The non-Chalcedonians, on the other hand, were moved by their hostility to the Council which had cost them even freedom to exist as rightful citizens in the Byzantine empire.

---

[1] Ad Nephalium, (Syriac), p. 157.

We shall now pass on to the Severian treatment of the term prosopon. "The doctors of the Church," he says, "have characterised hypostasis as prosopon."[1] However, there is a subtle difference of emphasis between the two terms. "When it comes into specific concreteness of existence whether simple or composite, hypostasis signifies a distinct prosopon."[2]

This point needs a word of explanation, for which the distinction between simple hypostasis and composite hypostasis is crucial. So before we discuss prosopon, we shall try to bring out the point of this distinction. As an illustration of simple hypostasis, he refers to the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. Man, on the other hand, is a composite hypostasis. A compound of body and soul, man is a body-soul entity; but the two were individuated together, each remaining in man perfectly, according to its principle. They converge, so to say, into the formation of man. At the very moment of their concurrence, man comes into being as a body-soul entity, and he receives a prosopon.

---

[1] Contra Grammaticum, op. cit., p. 74.

[2] Ibid., p. 76.

> The body and soul, of which a man is formed, each of them preserves its hypostasis, without either being confused with, or changed over to, the other. Since, however, they came into concrete existence, not separately but in composition, neither of them can be assigned a distinct prosopon.[1]

The point which Severus tries to make may be explained in this way. As we have noted, hypostasis is, for him, concrete existence resulting from the individuation of an ousia. It must be clear that he is taking ousia here in the Cappadocian sense, namely in the sense of a dynamic reality, and not as an aggregate of particulars belonging to a class. To use an illustration of our own, this table before me is a particular object belonging to the class "table." The ousia of table is neither a concrete object nor the class name: it is the archetype. It realises itself in concrete existence, when a carpenter makes a table. This table has a hypostasis and a prosopon. We may say that hypostasis represents the internal aspect, namely the individuation of the ousia, and prosopon the external aspect, namely the external mark of hypostasis by which it is distinguished from other hypostases of the same ousia. Every particular of a class, for instance, is an individuation of the same ousia in its entirety. However, they are distinguished one from another, because each one has a prosopon of its own. Severus quotes a passage from Nestorius in which the latter refers to himself as the prosopon of the Church.[1] The idea is that, as the archbishop of one of the major sees in Christendom, he speaks for the Church.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 77.

Composite hypostasis is, for Severus, the same as composite nature, and whatever is said of the former applies to the latter also. His illustration is man. Made up of body and soul, each of which is different from the other, we can say that he is of two natures or of two hypostases. Each of them is an individuation of its own ousia. If a body, for instance, ever came into existence without a soul, or a soul without a body, each would be a hypostasis with a prosopon of its own. In the case of man, however, neither body nor soul comes into concrete existence in this way. What happens is that the body-ousia and the soul-ousia, understood as dynamic realities, converge into the formation of a man, composite in hypostasis and nature, with one prosopon of his own. Therefore, man is "of two natures" or "of two hypostases." This, however, does not mean that, before they concurred into one, either body or soul had a hypostatic status. In order to avoid this misleading notion, Severus insists that the distinction between body and soul in man as hypostases is discerned by us only in thought. Therefore, neither before nor after the union do body and soul exist as separate hypostases. Man is a unity, but if we conceive of body and soul as separate one from the other the unity of his being cannot be explained. At the same time, body and soul are concrete in man, and therefore the expression "of two natures" or "of two hypostases" has to be conserved.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 119.

The Severian view of prosopon may be brought out more fully from his answer to the question, why we cannot speak of Christ as "of two prosopa." The Saviour, he insists, is "of two natures" or "of two hypostases." But we cannot go on to say that He is "of two prosopa." He writes:

> When hypostases have assumed their specific concreteness of existence and are separate one from another, each one of them has its own prosopon. But when two hypostases converge into a natural union and become completed into a unity of natures and hypostases free from confusion, as is seen in man, those out of which that oneness has come into being, are not to be conceived as distinct concretions, or be regarded as two prosopa, but should be taken as one.[1]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 181.

For Severus, therefore, prosopon is not something internal, belonging to the ousia itself. When an ousia is individuated into a hypostasis, it receives a prosopon. We shall see later that this understanding of the term "prosopon" was the basis of the non-Chalcedonian objection to the teaching of Nestorius; for he had assigned to Christ's manhood a prosopon of its own.

Chapter Two

Severus' Objections to the Council of Chalcedon

Theologically Severus had only one objection to Chalcedon, namely that the Council declared the phrase "in two natures" or "two natures after the Union" exclusively orthodox. On this basis, he had three points of criticism against the Council. (1) Its treatment of men. Dioscorus, for instance, was deposed, because he was opposed to the phrase; and Theodoret of Cyrus and Ibas of Edessa were acquitted, on the ground that these men were defenders of it. (2) Its acceptance of the Tome of Leo as an orthodox document of the Faith. (3) Its adoption of a Definition of the Faith with the phrase. We shall try in this chapter to bring out the way in which these criticisms were made by Severus, starting with the Council's treatment of men.

In his second letter to Sergius the Grammarian, Severus refers to Dioscorus as "a martyr for Christ who alone did not bend the knee to the Baal at the assembly of iniquity."[1] As we have already noted, from 482 on the non-Chalcedonian section of the Church also condemned Eutyches as a heretic by name. At the time when Severus started his literary career, Eutyches was believed by both parties in the Church to have actually taught the views which Chalcedon had endeavoured to read into him. This led non-Chalcedonian sympathisers to raise the query as to how their Dioscorus and the second Council of Ephesus could be justified for having condoned him. In several of his extant letters Severus undertakes to answer this question. To Sergius, the physician and sophist, Severus writes that he has treated the subject in detail, and that he has sent a copy of the writing to his correspondent. The present writer has not been able to refer to that work.[1] Since, however, we have seen the way in which Dioscorus was treated at Chalcedon, and since Severus makes in his letters the same point, we may legitimately assume that his work was an elaboration of the facts known to us. In the letter referred to, Severus writes:

---

[1] *Ad Nephalium*, *op. cit.*, p. 141.

> But with regard to the reception of Eutyches that it was done in a canonical way, and that it casts no slur on the holy Dioscorus, and on the Synod which assembled with him at Ephesus, I addressed the arguments on this head to certain persons some time ago, and I also dealt completely with it as the truth demands. . . . The holy Synod which assembled at Ephesus with the saintly witness of the truth Dioscorus taught nothing

---

[1] It has not been possible for me to discover whether it is extant or not.

> new whatever with regard to the faith, but only effected the deprivation of those who were infected with the Jewish poison of Nestorius and cast them off: but Eutyches, who presented a petition and anathematized his heresy, of which he was accused, it accepted on the ground of the actual petition itself and on the ground of the minutes that were written at Constantinople before Flavian.[1]

Again, in his letter to the orthodox brothers in the city of Tyre, he writes:

> Since you have thought it fit to ask me for what reason Eutyches is anathematised, the man of ill name and impious, and how it is that he was received by Dioscorus of saintly memory, we say in a few words that he was received on presenting a document which contained a right Confession of faith and anathematised Mani and Valentinus, and Apollinarius, and those who say that the flesh of our Lord and God Jesus Christ came down from heaven, to which he further added the words that follow,[2] though those who were assembled at Chalcedon interrupted the reading when the things that were written concerning him in the transactions at Ephesus were presented, in order to impute to him slanders which they wished. But the man of ill name seems again to have returned to his vomit.[3]

In a letter addressed to Neon, the presbyter and archimandrite, Severus says the same things about the decisions of the second Council of Ephesus. He writes:

---

[1] Patrologia Orientalis, XII, pp. 264-265.

[2] The words referred to in this letter have not come down to us. They might have been the words which we have quoted above pp. 46-7 from Hahn's Bibliothek.

[3] Patrologia Orientalis, XII, pp. 266-267.

> From these declarations what we have stated has been made clear. On the strength of the document /Eutyches' confession of faith/ and of the minutes written in the royal city containing depositions on the ground of which Eutyches had been condemned, the holy Synod which met in the city of the Ephesians declared him innocent. On account of the fact that, after these things, the same Eutyches ran back to the vomit of his own evil opinion, it /the Synod/ can never be accused. For neither against the holy fathers did this bring reproach, because many heretics consented to a temporary hypocrisy, and again returned to their impiety.[1]

On the strength of these passages, we can definitly say that the basis of our criticism of the Council's action in the case of Dioscorus had been known to Severus in the sixth century. As we have seen, the only ground on which Dioscorus was accused at Chalcedon was that the second Council of Ephesus had acquitted Eutyches and condemned Flavian and Eusebius of Dorylaeum. On the question of Eutyches' rehabilitation, Severus, who regards the old monk as a heretic, argues that in the minutes of the Home Synod of Constantinople there was no evidence to prove a charge of heresy against him. In other words, the charge of Eutychian leanings against Dioscorus, which is still being made by historians of our times, had been conclusively answered by men of the non-Chalcedonian ecclesiastical tradition even in ancient times.

---

[1] Ibid., XII, pp. 267-268.

In his criticism of Chalcedon, Severus does not accuse the Council of injustice, referring to the treatment which it meted out to Dioscorus. So far as we have evidence, Severus did not feel the need for raising a complaint against a Council which, in his view, was nothing but a heretical gathering. On the other hand, his concern was to exclude the "heresy of Chalcedon" and to interpret orthodoxy on the strength of the Church's tradition in the Faith. In fact, nowhere in his writings does he take Chalcedon as a Council of the Church, so that an appeal against its decision could be felt necessary. We can, however, regard his defence of Dioscorus as an accusation against Chalcedon.

Severus introduces the subject of Theodoret and Ibas in his letter to Sergius the physician and sophist to which we have already referred. After defending Dioscorus and the second Council of Ephesus against a charge that they had exonerated a heretic, he writes:

> But what will any one say about those who assembled at Chalcedon, who received Theodoret and Ibas, who not merely hid the foul heresy of Nestorius in their heart, but actually displayed it with open face?[1]

In his theological works, Severus quotes copiously from the writings of Theodoret and Nestorius and argues that they maintained the same view. We have already had occasion to see how Theodoret was acquitted by the Council of Chalcedon. Both he and Ibas had been deposed by the second Council of Ephesus on the charge of holding "Nestorian" views. In declaring them orthodox, the Council of Chalcedon did not examine the ground on which the Council of 449 had condemned them. In fact, their condemnation had been decided after lengthy examinations of charges against them.[1] The fact, however, has to be admitted that they had been condemned in their absence, and that therefore the Council was not altogether flawless.[2] The Council of Chalcedon, in condoning them, did not take in evidence the proceedings of the earlier Council, and therefore it was as much a partisan decision as that of the Council of 449.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 265-266.

The question whether there was any difference in theological emphasis between Nestorius and Theodoret, or between Nestorius and Ibas, cannot be attempted here.

---

[1] For the examination of the case of Ibas, see Perry: op. cit., pp. 38-145, and of Theodoret, ibid., pp. 207-258.

[2] Even on a point like this, the Council of Chalcedon cannot claim to have maintained a superior norm of justice; for it condemned Eutyches, not only without any proper evidence, but, as we have already noted, in his absence. But, in deposing Theodoret and Ibas, the Council of 449 had their writings which Chalcedonians declared heretical at the Council of Constantinople in 533.

In order to show that the Council of Chalcedon did not actually evince a spirit of impartiality in dealing with their question, we may refer to the way in which Ibas was acquitted by Chalcedon. In the case of the bishop of Edessa, one of the pieces of evidence against him was his letter to Maris the Persian. In it he gave his version of the dispute between Nestorius and Cyril, of the Council of 431, and of the concordat between Cyril and John of Antioch. According to Ibas,[1] Nestorius called in question the applicability of the title Theotokos to the Virgin, but Cyril, in aiming to refute Nestorius, "has been found to fall into the Dogma of Apollinarius," which was clearly expressed in his twelve anathematisms; for Cyril, "there is One Nature consisting of the Divinity and the Humanity of our Lord Jesus Christ" and "we ought not to distinguish between expressions which our Lord made in reference to Himself and those which the Evangelists (made) in reference to Him"; the Council of Ephesus in 431 met on account of this controversy, and since the Council accepted the anathematisms of Cyril there arose a breach in the Church, which was healed by the Concordat of 433, whereby Cyril accepted the true Faith as taught by Theodore of Mopsuestia and as presented to the former by John of Antioch, and agreed to anathematise all those who would not conform to it. Having related the story in this way, Ibas goes on:

---

[1] For an English translation of the letter from the Syriac original, see Perry, op. cit., pp. 111-119; and for its translation in Greek as presented at Chalcedon, see Mansi, VII, pp. 241-249.

> You can make known to all those our Brethren whom you consider lovers of peace, that the controversy is composed and the middle wall of enmity broken through, and those who so inordinately exalted themselves against the quick and the dead,[1] have become abashed, apologising for their folly, and teaching the very opposite to their former Doctrine. For, no one ventures to say (now) that there is One Nature (only)[2] of the Divinity and the Humanity (of Christ), but men openly avow the Temple and Him who dwells in it to be the One (only) Son Jesus Christ.

Even a superficial examination of the contents of this letter will make clear that for its writer (a) the Council of Ephesus in 431 was heretical; (b) Cyril was an Apollinarian heretic, but because he accepted the orthodox Faith from the Antiochenes at the time of the Concordat of 433, he may be deemed worthy of pardon; (c) Cyril and the entire Church abandoned the Alexandrine phrase "one incarnate Nature" as a basis for the Concordat and apologised for having used it; and (d) from 433 the whole Church accepted the Antiochene interpretation as the only norm of orthodoxy. The contents of this letter agree with our survey of the controversy,[1] and this document may be compared to the letters of Dioscorus to Domnus of Antioch.[2]

---

[1] In the letter, Ibas speaks of Theodore of Mopsuestia in glowing terms and protests against the Alexandrine attempts to regard him as a heretic. But it must be remembered that it was after the Concordat of 433 that Cyril wrote his work against Theodore and Diodore of Tarsus.

[2] Since the present writer has not had a chance to refer to the Syriac document lying behind Perry's translation, it is not possible to say why the bracketed "only" is added to "One Nature" here. In the Greek, as it was read at Chalcedon, the word used is μία If the word in Syriac is ܚܕ, this addition is unnecessary.

In spite of such a baffling distortion of facts which it tried to disseminate, the Roman legates at Chalcedon declared this letter itself orthodox,[3] and the assembly voted in favour of acquitting its writer. This incident is very significant. Coupled with the way in which Dioscorus was disposed of and the manner in which the Council formulated its Definition of the Faith, it enables us to understand the theological emphasis of the leaders of Chalcedon. A Council which accomplished these two things, and which declared orthodox the letter of Ibas, in spite of the fact that it renounced the Council of 431 as a heretical gathering and idealised the Antiochene interpretation as exclusively the Faith of the Church, cannot claim continuity either with that earlier Council or with the Alexandrine theological tradition. However, Chalcedon made both these claims. Its critics, on the other hand, while claiming to remain loyal to the Council of Ephesus in 431 as well as to the Alexandrine theological tradition, challenged the claims of Chalcedon. In the meantime, Zeno's Henotikon recognised in 482 the greatness of Cyril of Alexandria at the expense of Leo of Rome. From then on it became impossible for any Chalcedonian, whether of the Antiochene or of the Alexandrine theological persuasions, to ignore Cyril and claim to be orthodox. This is the historical background against which Severus opposed the Chalcedonian Definition of the Faith on the ground that it was nothing but "Nestorianism" in disguise. For an understanding of the way in which he criticised the Council's Formula on this ground, we have to examine his treatment of this important point.

---

[1] See above pp. 180f.

[2] See above pp. 167f.

[3] The Roman legates said: ἀναγνωσθείσης γὰρ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς αὐτοῦ, ἐπέγνωμεν αὐτὸν ὑπάρχειν ὀρθόδοξον. (Mansi, VII, p. 261). In his letter to Sergius the physician and sophist, Severus quotes the proceedings adopted by Chalcedon in the case of Ibas (*Patrologia Orientalis*, XII, pp. 265-266).

As we have already noted, his only objection to the Chalcedonian Formula was that it adopted the phrase "in two natures." He tried to substantiate his objection both on the ground of earlier tradition and on the basis of theological principles. Of these two, we shall take up first his argument on the strength of earlier tradition.

I. SEVERUS' OPPOSITION TO CHALCEDON ON THE BASIS OF TRADITION

Any objective estimate of the pre-Chalcedonian ecclesiastical tradition in regard to the Person of Christ will recognise the fact that, subsequent to the Formulary of Reunion of 433, the doctrinal decisions of the Councils of Nicea, Constantinople and Ephesus in 431 had become officially accepted by the entire Church as normative. As the last of these three Councils came to be recognised by the Antiochenes on the basis of the Formulary, that document had a claim to orthodoxy, which no one in the Church could gainsay. This is the situation in which the Eutychian question was taken up by the Home Synod of Constantinople in 448. Its decision, as we have shown, was neither a synthesis of the two Eastern theological ways of thinking, nor in harmony with the doctrinal basis of the Council of 431. In fact, it went beyond the terms of agreement that lay behind the Formulary as well as the contents of that document; for it declared exclusively orthodox the Antiochene phrase "two natures after the union." The Council of Chalcedon in 451 ratified this decision of the Byzantine Home Synod. There is absolutely no evidence that Chalcedon had any idea of accepting the Alexandrine phrases "of two natures" and "one incarnate nature." On the contrary, there is evidence that the Council replaced the "of two natures" by "in two natures" and while ignoring "one incarnate nature" sanctioned the Antiochene phrase "two natures after the union." All the same, the Alexandrine sympathisers present at the Council were given to understand that the Council of 431 was authoritative, and that Cyril was still an eminently orthodox theologian of the Church. With uneasy feelings, but impotent to express themselves clearly, these men believed everything that was told. After the Council, faced with opposition from the Council's critics, they began to claim Cyril for Chalcedon. By and by they collected excerpts from the writings of Cyril to substantiate their thesis. On the face of it, it was not a tenable proposition. However, Chalcedonians who could make the world believe, on the evidence which we have seen, that Eutyches was really a heretic and that Dioscorus was a "Eutychian" could find nothing impossible. For an understanding of Severus' opposition to Chalcedon on the strength of tradition, this Chalcedonian work and its refutation by the non-Chalcedonian theologian is of great importance.[1]

---

[1] Sellers refers to the Chalcedonian work and also to its refutation by Severus (op. cit., pp. 284-292). He seems to conclude, as probably Chalcedonians in the sixth century had done, that the extracts adequately established a connection between Cyril and Chalcedon, and that the objection of Severus was really pointless.

Nobody had called in question the fact that the Antiochene theological development from Theodore of Mopsuestia and Diodore of Tarsus was based on the idea lying behind the phrase "two natures after the union" or even the "in two natures". But these men and the entire theological system which they had built up had been anathema to the Alexandrines. On the other hand, the men on the Alexandrine side had a recognition in the Church which even the Antiochenes could not easily ignore. Now if Chalcedon were to be declared orthodox, its adherents had to prove that the idea behind the phrase "in two natures" had been granted by Alexandrine theologians, and the one man in whose writings the idea had to be shown was Cyril.

The Chalcedonian compiler tried to prove his thesis in two ways. One: by quoting the Definitio of Chalcedon clause by clause and subjoining each with appropriate extracts from the works of Cyril. Thus when it came to the phrase "in two natures" in the Definitio, two Cyrilline passages were quoted, which will engage our attention in a moment. Two: by making a collection of two hundred and forty-four passages from Cyril to show that he had recognised the principle of "difference between the two natures" and that therefore he had anticipated the phrase "in two natures". It must be remembered that no theologian recognised by the non-Chalcedonian section of the Church had ever disputed the fact that the natures were different. Therefore, the issue to be decided was whether, from a recognition of the "difference of the natures", Cyril would have gone on to affirm "two natures after the union", or whether he would still have stood by the phrase "one incarnate nature". As might be expected, the Chalcedonian compiler argued for the former conclusion and Severus for the latter. By referring to a few selected excerpts and the refutation of Severus, we have to see whether the Chalcedonian compiler succeeded at all in proving his thesis.

In his work, The Council of Chalcedon, Sellers refers to seven of these excerpts and seems to think that the Chalcedonian compiler proved his thesis. As we are inclined to disagree with Sellers on this point, it is fair that we examine those excerpts themselves, though, to be brief, we have to be satisfied with three of them only.

Chalcedon	Cyril
Cap. 4:[1] One and the Same Christ Jesus (our) Lord the Only begotten, who is made known in two natures without	Reflecting therefore, as I said, on the Incarnation, we see that two natures have come together into

---

[1] Sellers, op. cit., p. 288 has this as cap. 1. We quote this from the Philalethes of Severus (Syriac, ed. Robert Hespel in Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalum), pp. 7-8.

confusion, without change, without division, without separation.

an indivisible union. For the flesh is flesh, and not Godhead, though it became the flesh of God. In the same way is God the Word; [He is] not flesh even when He made the flesh His own in the dispensation.

Again from the same writing.

We say that there are two natures; but one Christ, Son and Lord, God the Word incarnate and made man.[1]

In his refutation, Severus raises two fundamental objections to these excerpts. One: the two quotations were taken from a letter of Cyril, in which both between the two and following the second the central emphasis of Cyrilline theology in regard to the phrases is to be found. But the Chalcedonian compiler picked out two statements, without paying any heed to the context. Two: the second quotation mutilated the crucial word found in the original. In order to substantiate his criticism, Severus quotes the entire passage. We shall reproduce it here, indicating by means of brackets the parts omitted by the Chalcedonian compiler.

> Reflecting therefore, as I said, on the manner of the Incarnation, we see that two natures have come together into an indivisible, unconfusable, and unchangeable union. For the flesh is flesh, and not Godhead, though it became the flesh of God. In the same way is

---

[1] The two quotations are from Cyril's first letter to Succensus of Diocaesarea.

also the Word. He is God, not flesh, though in the dispensation He made the flesh His own. (Reflecting therefore on this, there is no harm in saying that, along with the concurrence with each other, there was a union of two natures. But after the union we do not divide the natures one from the other, neither do we set apart into two Sons Him who is one and indivisible. On the contrary, we affirm one Son, as the fathers have done, one incarnate nature of the Word. Therefore, in so far as is permissible to thought and only for us to see by the eyes of the soul, concerning the manner in which the Only begotten became incarnate), we say that there are two natures (which have been united-- ܕܐܬܚܝܕܘ, or as in Greek δύο τὰς φύσεις εἶναι· φάμεν τὰς ἑνωθείσας),[1] but one Christ and Lord and Son, the Word of God incarnate and made man.[2] (If it be befitting, we shall have as an illustration our own composition, by reason of which we are men. We are composed of soul and body, and we see two natures; for the nature of the body is one, and that of the soul is another. But because of the union of both, man is one. Since we are composed of two natures,[3] he who

---

[1] According to Severus, this clause read in some recognised MSS: "We say that the two natures have been united" without the "there are."

[2] The point is not that the Chalcedonian compiler had objection to using the omitted word, but that with the addition of the word ἑνωθείσας the passage would yield only an admission of the phrase "of two natures." Therefore the omission must have been deliberate.

[3] The printed Syriac text of Robert Hespel has ܘܟܠ ܗܘܝܢ ܡܢ ܬܪ̈ܬܝܢ ܡܪܟܒܝܢ [illegible] (p. 161) which does not make much sense. So an emendation to read it as ܘܟܠ ܟܕܗܘܝܢ . — . is suggested here.

> has been made one should not be conceived of as two men; but by reason of the composition of soul and body, as I said, he is one. Those who fight against the orthodox faith say that if we remove the "of two natures" and the "different," Christ is [affirmed as] one and unique, without being divided after the union. If He is altogether one nature, how was He made man, and how did He make the flesh His own?)[1]

How a few sentences or clauses quoted from this passage could be regarded as adequate to prove that Chalcedon had been anticipated by Cyril, or that he had given sanction to the very phrase, "two natures after the union", which he had opposed throughout his life, is beyond our capacity to understand. The Chalcedonian work on this point proves one fact. In none of the many volumes of the Cyrilline writings, the Chalcedonian compiler succeeded in finding a single statement in support of his thesis that the Alexandrine theologian was a forerunner of Chalcedon.[2] In fact, it would seem that the Chalcedonian work was a desperate attempt to prove something which could not be proved.

---

[1] Philalethes, _op. cit._, pp. 159-161. _Patrologia Graece_ LXXVII 232-233.

[2] Sellers' treatment of this point is rather bewildering (See _op. cit._, pp. 288-289). He gives the Chalcedonian compiler's quotation from the Council's _Definitio_, and the first excerpt from the Cyrilline passage, but shows no knowledge of the second excerpt. His treatment of the Chalcedonian work and of Severus' refutation (pp. 282-292) may be thus summarised. Severus criticised the Chalcedonian work on the plea that the defenders of the Council had not accepted the Alexandrine phrases "of two natures" and "one incarnate nature"; that the Chalcedonians had, in fact, affirmed these phrases; and that therefore the argument of Severus was not cogent.

This statement may be further substantiated by examining the rest of the excerpts.

Chalcedon	Cyril
Cap. 5: the difference of the natures having been in no wise taken away by reason of the union.[1]	not as though the difference of the natures was taken away by reason of the union.[1]

Severus starts his refutation with this statement. "He" (the Chalcedonian compiler) "thinks that if the natures are different, we can speak of the one Christ 'two natures', and not 'one incarnate nature'". His point obviously is that the phrase "two natures after the union" means more than a mere recognition of the difference of the natures, and that the phrase "one incarnate nature" does deny the fact that the natures are different.

In describing the controversy in this way, Sellers seems to have entirely missed the point of Severus. What he maintained may be put in this way. Chalcedon had opposed both "of two natures" and "one incarnate nature"; that therefore the sixth century Chalcedonian exponents were wrong in their estimate of the Council; and that the one sentence which they had quoted from Cyril to prove their thesis was not only taken out of context, but was also mutilated. All these points of Severus were perfectly accurate.

[1] Philalethes, op. cit., p. 8. For Sellers' treatment of this excerpt see op. cit., p. 298.

He then proceeds to show that this clause also was taken out of context, and quotes Cyril to prove his point. Here also the parts not included by the Chalcedonian compiler are shown within parentheses.

> (For we do not say that the nature of God the Word, having undergone change, became man, nor that He was converted into a complete man of soul and body; but that the Word, having united to Himself flesh animated with a rational soul, became man ineffably and inconceivably. He was called the Son of man, not merely in will and pleasure, nor by reason of an assumption of prosopon; but because the natures which are different have come together into a real union, He is one Christ and Son of both;) not as though the difference of the natures was taken away by reason of the union, (but because the two have become perfected into one Lord, Christ and Son from Godhead and manhood by reason of an ineffable and indescribable concurrence into union.)[1]

What is proved from this passage is that, on the strength of the phrase "of two natures," Cyril had maintained the principle of difference between the natures. That the Chalcedonian phrase "in two natures" was justified, does not therefore follow from this at all.

---

[1] Philalethes, op. cit., pp. 164-165. PG, LXXVII, p. 45. This passage is taken from the second letter of Cyril to Nestorius.

Chalcedon	Cyril
Cap. 6: but rather the properties of each being preserved.[1]	Though we affirm that the Only begotten Son of God became incarnate and was made man, He is not for this reason confused, as it seems to them. For the nature of the Word did not pass over into the nature of the flesh; neither did that of the flesh into the Word's; but, as we have now said, each of them remaining in its natural signification of property and is being known.[1]

Severus has two objections to this excerpt. In the first place, he says that it does not include the word "together" after the words "each of them remaining," and that therefore it is not an exact quotation of what Cyril had written.[2] Secondly, he points out that, following this quotation, Cyril went on to defend the phrase "one incarnate nature," and even answered the charge of "confusion" levelled against it by Antiochenes. Severus quotes the passage in this way.

---

[1] The two quotations are taken from *Philalethes, op. cit.*, pp. 8-9. For Sellers' treatment, see *op. cit.*, p. 289.

[2] This word is not found in *Patrologia Graece*, and we cannot therefore take this criticism seriously. Severus argues assuming the word to be in the work of Cyril. It is therefore very likely that the copy which Severus used had this word.

> but, as we have now said, each of them remaining together in its natural signification of property and is being conceived, (the ineffable and indescribable union has shown to us one nature of the Son, but, as I said, incarnate. For it is not merely to those which are simple in nature that the word "one" really applies, but also to those which have come together in composition, as is the case of man who is made up of soul and body. They (the body and soul) belong to different forms, and are not of the same substance with each other. But when united, they become perfected into one nature of man, though in principles of composition there exists difference in nature between those that have come together into the union. Therefore, those who say that, if the incarnate Word is one nature, confusion and mixture are sure to follow, as though the human nature becomes reduced or stolen, speak things that are excessive. For it (the phrase) does not reduce, as they say, nor is the human nature stolen. In order to safeguard the full affirmation that He became man, it is enough to say that He was incarnate. Had we ignored it, there would be room for their objection. Since we have added (it) as something indispensable, where is any kind of reduction or stealing?)[1]

In this passage taken from Cyril's second letter to Succensus of Diocaesarea, we find an eloquent defense of the phrase "one incarnate nature." On the basis of this phrase alone and without showing any inclination to accept the Antiochene phrase "two natures after the incarnation," Cyril maintains here the principle of a difference between the natures. Therefore, the Chalcedonian work did not prove its thesis. This point will become still clearer if we examine the two hundred forty-four other excerpts.

---

[1] Philalethes, op. cit., pp. 167-168. Patrologia Graece, LXXVII, p. 241.

The Collection, as its title shows,[1] was intended to prove that the difference of the natures had been granted by Cyril. Though the compiler might have meant to draw the implication that the opponents of the Council would not grant it, Severus makes it clear in many places of his answer that his section of the Church affirms that principle, and that his objection was only to the adoption of it as a basis for either speaking of Christ in two natures or dividing the properties of the natures so as to conceive of the natures themselves as two entities. He also argues that his section of the Church affirms the principle of difference between the natures in the same way as Cyril had done.

From the excerpts what was proved may be so stated. In the one incarnate Person of God the Word there exist both divine properties and human properties. These are not confused or mixed; neither have the properties of the one changed over into those of the other. But both are expressed by the one incarnate Person. More than ten of the excerpts, as Severus shows, were taken from passages in which Cyril had maintained this principle by means of the phrase "one incarnate nature," though the Chalcedonian compiler did not make that fact clear. Therefore, argues Severus, Chalcedonians were wrong in claiming that Cyril was a forerunner of the Council.

---

[1] Philalethes, op. cit., p. 11. The title is: "Various evidences from Cyril, archbishop of Alexandria, (in which the difference of the natures, namely that of the impassible and immortal God the Word and that of the passible and mortal temple, is recognised by him)."

In order to see the way in which Severus treated the Chalcedonian work, we shall reproduce here three excerpts and their refutation by the non-Chalcedonian theologian.

The excerpt[1]	Severus
(From the second letter of Cyril to Nestorius) For we do not say that the nature of the Word was changed and became flesh; neither that He was converted to a perfect man of soul and body; but that the Word united to Him indeed flesh animated with a rational soul hypostatically, and became man ineffably and	It seems to me unnecessary that he (the Chalcedonian compiler) has taken up this vain task. For we do not say either that God the Word was changed over to man, made up of soul and body. But we confess that, while remaining what He is, He was united hypostatically to the flesh possessing a rational soul. Show us in the *Definitio* that the Council of Chalcedon confessed this same thing. This is the point on which objection has been raised

---

[1] *Philalethes*, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

above. Had it confessed hypostatic union, the Council would have confessed also "one incarnate nature of God the Word," and would not have defined that the one Christ is in two natures, thereby dissolving the union.[1]

Excerpt 54

(From letter to Succensus)

Though we affirm nature of manhood and of Godhead of Emmanuel, the manhood became the own of the Word, and He is known one Son with it.[2]

Severus says that in the passage from which this excerpt was taken Cyril had affirmed "one incarnate nature" and opposed "two natures after the union." Immediately after the excerpt the Cyrilline writing continues:

"Since the inspired Scripture says that He suffered in the flesh, it is right that we also affirm it, namely that (He suffered) in the human nature. Some who say it, if they do not speak with any evil motivation, it does not harm the principle of the mystery. For what is human nature, but flesh animated with rational soul? We say that the Lord suffered in the flesh. To say that He suffered in the human nature, in order to set him apart from the Word and to place him alone by himself, whereby to declare two natures, and not one incarnate and humanised Word of God the Father, is most certainly excessive."[3]

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 187. The charges against Chalcedon contained in this passage were treated by him. For a reference to them, see below pp. 341f.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 32.

[3] *Philalethes*, *op. cit.*, p. 275.

For Severus, this passage in the Cyrilline writing is an adequate evidence that the Alexandrine theologian was opposed to the pharse "two natures after the union." But the Chalcedonian compiler, by quoting a sentence just preceding this passage, seemed to think that it could be taken as a proof for his thesis.

> Excerpt 72 (from Cyril's second letter to the monks). The wise John has said: "the Word became flesh." But He became flesh, not by having been changed to the nature of the flesh by means of conversion, transformation or mutation; neither by means of confusion or mixture. He did not undergo confusion of the natures, as some people accuse. Since He is of an unchangeable and inconvertible nature, this is not possible. But He assumed flesh, from the holy and pure body--flesh, as I said, which was animated with a rational soul--and made it His own. It is customary, for the holy Scripture to use the word "flesh" alone in referring to a complete man; as for instance, "I pour my spirit on all flesh." It is not on flesh without rational soul that promises to pour the grace of the Spirit, but specifically on men who have their being in spirit and body.[1]

In answer to this extract also Severus makes it clear that "many times before I have made it very plain that those who affirm 'one incarnate nature of God the Word' are never guilty of the charge of 'confusion,' that is 'mixture of the natures.'" He then goes on to contend that even this passage, if only the compiler extended it to include the following statement also from the same writing of Cyril, would be found, in its context, opposed to Chalcedon.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 40.

> Not that Christ was known first as man, and then came to be God; but that, while He is God the Word, He became man, so that in the same [being] it may be known that He is at once God and man. But those who divide Him into two Sons venture also to say that the Word associated with Himself a man of the seed of David, and that subsequently the Word gave Him [the man] authority and honour and dominion of the Son, whereby making Him suffer the Cross and die, live [again] and ascend to heaven and sit at the right hand of the Father. In this way, He is made an object of worship from all creation, so that by reason of the fact that God entered into Him He may receive honour. As for these people, they confess first two Sons, whereby reversing the mystery unlearnedly."[1]

Severus argues in many places of his refutation that Chalcedon did not actually go beyond the position excluded by Cyril in this passage. In our treatment of his theological objection to Chalcedon, we shall try to bring out his ground for making this drastic criticism. Before we pass on to that subject, we have to deal with another point with reference to the earlier tradition of the Church.

In our survey of the controversy between Chalcedonians and Severus, we have seen thus far that the former, in their efforts to establish a theological continuity between Cyril and Chalcedon, did not actually prove their thesis. They showed that Cyril had maintained the principle of difference between the two natures.

---

[1] Philalethes, op. cit., p. 300.

Severus answered that his section of the Church also accepted it, but that from it the Chalcedonian phrase "in two natures" would not follow. If we comment on the situation, Chalcedonians did not succeed in proving that the Council's phrase had ever been sanctioned by any of the three earlier authoritative Councils, or by Cyril who had given expression to the Alexandrine tradition in the most comprehensive way history had till then known. Chalcedonians, however, could point to the *Formulary of Reunion* of 433 as a document by means of which Cyril could be claimed for Chalcedon. Severus deals with this subject both in the *Philalethes* and *Contra Grammaticum*.

In order to make his point clear, we may explain the issue in a few words. That Jesus Christ was at once God and man had never been disputed by men recognised by either the Antiochene or the Alexandrine sides. So the controversy centred round the status assigned to the two natures by either side. On this issue, the Antiochenes would conceive of the human nature being unceasingly united prosopically with the divine nature. The human nature was conceived in the Virgin's womb, and, ever since, it was in an unbroken association (συναφεια) with God the Son. United with the divine nature in this way, the human nature performed what is human, and, upholding the latter, the divine nature performed what is divine. Since the prosopic union was real, the operation of each nature was applicable to the other also. It was on the basis of a theological thinking of this kind that Theodoret and other Antiochenes had opposed the "hypostatic union" of Cyril.

The Alexandrines, on the other hand, emphasised the union as hypostatic, whereby they were concerned to affirm an inner ego resulting from a union of the two natures. For them, both natures were real. They were different one from the other, and each had its properties. But in Christ, since the natures came together to form a united inner ego, though we can in our contemplation distinguish the natures and their respective properties, it was not each nature that performed what is its own, but the one united inner ego operated through both natures and expressed itself by means of the one prosopon. This was the theological basis on which the Alexandrines clung to the phrases "of two natures" and "one incarnate nature" and resisted the phrase "two natures after the union." So Cyril wrote in his second Tome against Nestorius:

> Everything said was as of one prosopon; for after the union it is known that He is one nature of the Word incarnate.[1]

The Formulary of Reunion contained these words:

---

[1] Quoted in the Philalethes, op. cit., p. 189. P. Gr., LXXVI, p. 60.

> In regard to the evangelical and apostolic words concerning the Lord, we know that theologians take some as of the common referring to the one prosopon, and divide the others between the two natures, ascribing the God-befitting ones to the Godhead of Christ and the lowly ones to the manhood.[1]

As we have already noted, these words were quoted by Cyril in the Formulary from a statement of the Faith sent him by John of Antioch. Severus admits that these are not words proceeding forth from an absolutely sound theological thinking. He, however, argues that, in regard to these words approvingly quoted by Cyril for whom the dividing of words between two natures was an anathema, there are two considerations to be borne in mind. In the first place, the historical context in which these words were accepted; and in the second, their actual implication. As for the first, Severus argues that Cyril approved them as a concession to the Antiochenes at a time when the Church was divided, so that, subsequent to the establishment of peace, the Antiochenes might be enabled to understand better the principles of orthodoxy. The fact, however, is, argues the non-Chalcedonian theologian, that Cyril made this concession only after having conserved all principles of the Faith. Thus he saw to it that the Antiochenes agreed to accept the Council of

---

[1] This statement is quoted above p. 185. Here it is taken from the Philalethes, op. cit., p. 201.

431, to proclaim the title Theotokos in respect of the Virgin without the addition of anthropotokos, and to renounce Nestorius as a heretic. Viewed in the light of these admissions, these words are harmless.

With regard to the second consideration, namely the actual implication of these words, Severus contends that they do not mean that the One Christ can be divided into two natures. "The dividing of the words" which they contain is not intended to "divide them" (the words)

> between the natures in such a way that some could be ascribed to the divine nature alone, and some to the human nature exclusively; but they are of the one incarnate nature of the Word. We recognise the difference of the words; some are God-befitting, some man-befitting, and some befitting both Godhead and manhood together.[1]

Therefore, according to Severus, the Formulary of Reunion did not sanction the use of the Antiochene phrase "two natures after the union." Chalcedon, on the other hand, as he contends, went beyond the Formulary, and declared normative the disputed phrase. In our survey of the facts connected with the condemnation of Eutyches both by the Home Synod of Constantinople and by Chalcedon, we have seen that the ground of this action was the old monk's refusal to accept the Antiochene phrase. We have also seen that neither at Ephesus in 449 nor at Chalcedon, Dioscorus or any other Alexandrine raised any objection to the Formulary, but that at Chalcedon Dioscorus spoke taking it for granted that it was a document of the Faith. These facts make us conclude that Severus' version of history was accurate. In other words, Chalcedonians in the sixth century did not prove on the strength of tradition, that the Council's phrase "in two natures" had roots in the Alexandrine theological thinking. It was Antiochene. The sixth century Chalcedonians were not trying to synthesise the theological principles of the two traditions; but they, assuming as anti-Antiochene a stand as of the non-Chalcedonians, were misinterpreting Cyril to make him fit in with their own explanation of Chalcedon. In this attempt, they twisted the theology both of Cyril and of the leading men at the Council of 451.[1] The way in which they misinterpreted Cyril will engage our attention later. We shall now pass on to examine the argument of Severus that they were not true to Chalcedon.

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 201-202. For Severus' treatment of this subject, see Ibid., pp. 197-202. Contr. Gr. III.

---

[1] Therefore, facts do not permit us to take the view that Chalcedon made a synthesis of the three earlier traditions, even as a hypothesis. Sellers, however, assumes that it is a tenable thesis. So he comments on the Philalethes of Severus: "Thus Severus denounced the Tractate" (the Chalcedonian work) "as, nothing less than a 'piece of mischief,' which deserved the title, 'That the blessed Cyril said, "Two natures after the union."' Thoroughly anti-Nestorian in outlook, he did not recognize that the formulas of the Alexandrine orthodoxy could easily give rise to the Eutychian view of our Lord's Person, and that the Council of Chalcedon, through affirming that the two natures remained in Him, each in its reality, after the union, was but expressing the Alexandrine faith in such a way that it could not be falsely interpreted" (op. cit., pp. 291-292). Facts about the controversy

II. OPPOSITION TO CHALCEDON ON THE BASIS OF THEOLOGICAL PRINCIPLES

Severus' objection to Chalcedon from the point of view of theological principles may be analysed in this way. (1) The Council declared exclusively orthodox the Antiochene phrase "two natures after the union," on which was based the teaching of Nestorius. (2) The Tome of Leo which the Council declared an orthodox document of the Faith contained nothing but what Nestorius had maintained.

---

between Severus and Chalcedonians of his day are such that the former's characterisation of the latter's work was fully justified. That Chalcedon was expressing the Alexandrine faith without the possibility of a misleading interpretation, was the claim of sixth century Chalcedonians, and that was precisely the point which Severus called in question. The Chalcedonian claim itself is based on the assumption that the Council of 451 had proved a charge of heresy against Eutyches, which, as we have shown, is not true. Severus himself made that point clear. Therefore, in regard to the dispute between Chalcedonians and non-Chalcedonians "Eutychianism" is not an issue. On the other hand, the issue is: was Chalcedon justified in offending the entire Alexandrine conservative sentiment and insisting on the Antiochene phrase, simply because Leo's Tome contained it and the imperial policy was in favour of Leo? That the sixth century Chalcedonians in the East were willing to adopt the Alexandrine phrases is no answer to this question. For, as we have already noted, this was done in opposition to the intention of the leaders of Chalcedon. We shall see more clearly later that, according to Severus, the sixth century Chalcedonians distorted the theology of Cyril also on a crucial point.

(3) Though the Council's Definitio contained the affirmation of personal unity, it did not mean hypostatic union, but only prosopic union. Therefore, the theological basis of the Council was the teaching of Nestorius.

(1) Objection to the phrase "in two natures".

For an evaluation of the Severian opposition to this phrase, the sense in which the Antiochenes had maintained "two natures" is important. In order to bring out this point Severus quotes extensively from the works of men like Theodore of Mopsuestia, Diodore of Tarsus, Nestorius, Theodoret of Cyrus and others of the Antiochenes whose works were available to him. We shall reproduce here a few of those quotations.

From Diodore:

> While the flesh was of Mary and before it was assumed, it was of the earth and was not different in any way from other "fleshes." Like Levi who received tithes while he was still in the loins and received honour when he was born, in the same way the Lord, when He was in the womb of the Virgin, was of her ousia, and He did not have the honour of Sonship. But when He was formed and became the temple of God the Word and received the Only begotten, He was bestowed with the honour of the name and subsequently received also from Him honour.[1]

This passage, says Severus, was opposed by Cyril in the following words:

---

[1] Philalethes, op. cit., p. 140. Contr. Gr., op. cit., p. 182. Lebon, I, p. 182.

> You are giving expression to unlearned words which are very unhealthy. For that holy flesh was from Mary. But from the first beginnings of its formation, that is its existence in the womb, it was holy, as the body of Christ; and nobody sees a single moment in which it was not His. All the same, as you say, it was common (flesh) like any other flesh.[1]

The point to be noted is that both Cyril and Severus took the passage from Diodore to mean a view of Christ's birth, according to which the humanity of Christ was formed in the Virgin's womb prior to the union of the natures. It is this emphasis that lay behind the objection to the title Theotokos as applied to the Virgin which Nestorius raised. In fact, this point had already been made by Theodore of Mopsuestia when he wrote:

> When they ask whether Mary was anthropotokos or Theotokos, we shall answer that she was both. The former, by reason of the nature of the act; and the latter on account of the exaltation. By nature, she was anthropotokos; he who was in the womb of Mary was man and he came forth from there. She is Theotokos, because God was in the man that was born. It is not that He was limited to him by nature; but that He was in him as by an association of will ( ).[2]

Nestorius also, says Severus, held the same view. For he wrote:

---

[1] PG., LXXVI, p. 1450.

[2] Contr. Gr., I, pp. 134-135.

> Mary did not give birth to Godhead, O great one. That which is born of the flesh is flesh. A creature did not give birth to the uncreated. The Father did not beget God the Word anew from the Virgin. As John says, "in the beginning was the Word." Therefore, a creature did not give birth to the uncreated; but she gave birth to the man who was an instrument of Godhead. The Holy Spirit did not create God the Word; for He who is in her is said to be the Holy Spirit; but He (the Holy Spirit) formed from the Virgin a temple for God the Word. When He was made man, God did not die, but He raised him, in whom He became man.[1]

Severus argues that Theodoret's view was not different, and quotes from the latter's work written in opposition to Cyril's first anathematism.

> If, therefore, God the Word did not become flesh, but took animated and rational flesh, it was not He in His nature that was born of the Virgin, being conceived, formed and shaped, and from there receiving a beginning of being; (for) He is before the ages with God and with the Father, known and worshipped with the Father; but having

---

[1] Philalethes, op. cit., pp. 140-141. Loofs, Nestoriana, p.252. In fact, passages like this from the works of the Antiochenes were not to be interpreted literally; for they were trying to put in words a theological concern which should not have been denied a right to exist in the Church. At the same time, it must be remembered that their criticism of the Alexandrine position was absolutely unjustifiable. A Cyril who agreed concordat of 433 or a Dioscorus and his followers who never opposed the Formulary of Reunion had more appreciation for the Antiochene theological concern than a Theodoret and the leaders of Chalcedon has for the theological conviction of the Alexandrines.

> formed for Him a temple in the Virgin's womb, He is with him who was formed, conceived and shaped and born.[1]

Criticising the second anathematism of Cyril, Theodoret wrote:

> Following the divine teaching of the Apostles, we confess Christ to be one. On account of the union, we name the Same God and man. But the hypostatic union, as it is far from, and alien to, the divine Scriptures as well as to the fathers who interpreted them, we do not recognise at all.[2]

On the strength of these quotations, Severus contends that those who had used the phrase "two natures after the union" did not believe in the Scriptural testimony that the Word became flesh, and that they did not confess the "hypostatic union." For an added confirmation of his conclusion, he refers to the Antiochene criticism of the title Theotokos as applied to the Virgin. In a letter written from Ephesus to a friend, Nestorius, while renouncing Cyril as a heretic, expressed his view of the matter in these words:

---

[1] Philalethes, op. cit., p. 142. PG., LXXVI, p. 393.

[2] Philalethes, op. cit., p. 142. PG., LXXVI, p. 400. We have no evidence that Theodoret changed his mind on this point. Therefore, whatever the sixth century Chalcedonians might have said about Chalcedon, the Council had not made the theory of hypostatic union essential to Christian orthodoxy, and the theological synthesis of which Sellers speaks as though Chalcedon had made it is the result of an inaccurate reading of facts.

> But for us, the word anthropotokos should be placed along side of the word Theotokos. (If this is done), we think that correctness of piety is conserved.[1]

Theodoret also, says Severus, expressed the same sentiment, when he wrote criticising the first anathematism of Cyril.

> Not anthropotokos, but also Theotokos we preach about the Virgin, taking the former as referring to creation, formation and birth, and the latter to the union.[2]

An interpretation of this kind, pleads Severus, is based on regarding the union as prosopic, rather than hypostatic. The bishop of Cyrus himself admitted it, when he wrote:

> It is right to confess one prosopon, Son and Christ. But those which came into union were two hypostases; it is not incorrect to say two natures.[3]

What, then, is the error of the theological position that lies behind these and many other similar passages? Severus answers this question in several places of his writings. In the Philalethes he puts it summarily in these words:

> Those who are disposed to divide the one Jesus Christ our Lord into two natures form man in the womb of the Virgin first,

---

[1] Philalethes, op. cit., p. 147. Loofs, pp. 191-192.

[2] Ibid., p. 148. PG., LXXVI, p. 404.

[3] Philalethes, op. cit., p. 148. PG., LXXVI, p. 420.

> and assign to him concrete existence by himself, saying that God the Word dwelt in him. This indwelling they conceal by means of the suitable word 'union'. In this way, consistent with their thinking, they divide the Emmanuel into two natures.[1]

In his Contra Grammaticum, Severus argues that this view has to conceive of "two prospa, two Sons, Christs, hypostases and natures,"[2] and goes on to make the same point.

> Those who form the child in the womb of the Virgin first, and assign to him time to receive a concrete existence of his own let God the Word dwell in him by means of an association of harmony. This they speak aloud as a union in prosopon.[3]

According to Severus, the error of the Antiochene position lies in the fact that it conceives of a human child as having come into being prior to the union. It is because of this insistence, that Nestorius and the men of his way of thinking were opposed to the idea lying behind hypostatic union. For them, two natures meant two concrete beings. The union between them is nothing but an association, whereby "the nature of the Word gave the human nature the name Son and Lord, the honour befitting God, authority and equality." This view of our Lord, says Severus, assigns the names Christ and

---

[1] Ibid., p. 138.

[2] Contra Grammaticum, Vol. I., pp. 181-182.

[3] Ibid.

Jesus to the human nature, namely to the form of the servant. It also can conceive of an exchange of names between the human and the divine natures, by means of which the suffering and passion which the former undenvent could be attributed to the Word of God. In this way, complains Severus, they ascribe to the prosopon of the one Christ two natures, and prosopa and hypostases.[1] All this, according to Severus, endangers the union as well as the uniqueness of Christ.

It is this view of Christ that the Council of Chalcedon declared exclusively orthodox, by insisting on the phrase "two natures after the union". He proceeds to substantiate his view of the Council by referring both to the *Tome* of Leo and to the Council's *Definitio*. We shall examine first his criticism of the *Tome*.

(2) *Objection to the Tome of Leo*

We have seen that at the Council of Chalcedon the Palestinian and the Illyrian bishops raised three passages in the *Tome* as inconsistent with the teaching of Cyril, and that no satisfactory answer was given them. In the peculiar atmosphere of the Council, those bishops were not ready to press the query further. The Crities of the Council showed a determination to challenge the orthodoxy of the *Tome* on the basis of those passages. They believed that, in spite of the personal union of which the Antiochenes had spoken, their interpretation conceived of two centres of being, and that the *Tome* of Leo did not go beyond that. We shall try to bring out the way in which Severus attempted to make his point.

---

[1] *Philalethes*, *op. cit.*, p. 143.

According to Severus, the Antiochene phrase "two natures after the union" was intended to exclude the idea of a "hypostatic union" in the interests of a "prosopie union". Leo's *Tome* did not affirm anything more than the latter. The passages from it which he repeatedly quotes to make his point may be reproduced here.

> Each form performs what is proper to it in communion with the other; the Word, for instance, what is the Word's, the body those that are of the body. One of them shines forth in miracles, and the other succumbs to injury.

Again,

> It is not of the same nature to say, 'I and the Father are one,' and 'My Father is greater than me'.[1]
>
> To feel hungry and thirsty, to be wearied and sleep are truly human. But to feed five thousand people with five loaves; to give the Samaritan woman living water, from which she might draw and never be thirsty again; to walk on the surface of the sea, without feet being sunk; and to calm the troubled

---

[1] *Contra Grammaticum*, Vol. I., p. 284. The first of these was the second passage raised by the Palestinian and the Illyrian bishops at Chalcedon. See above p. 112.

> billows by rebuking the tempest, are undoubtedly divine. To omit many examples, it is not of the same nature to weep in sympathy for a friend who was dead, and to raise by a word of power the same friend from the tomb, having removed the stone which had been placed over it for four days; or, to be hung on the wood, while the order of day was changed over to that of night and everything being trembled; or, to be pierced with nails, and to open the gates of Paradise to the faith of the robber.[1]
>
> And there is nothing false about this union, whilst both, the lowliness of man and the loftiness of God, are one with the other. For as change does not overtake God by reason of [His] compassion, so man is not reduced to nothingness by reason of the great divine power.

Again:

> For although in our Lord Jesus Christ there is one prosopon of God and man, yet that of which injury is common to both is one thing, and that of which flory is common to both is another. For He has from us manhood which is inferior to the Father, and from the Father Godhead which is equal to the Father. It is on account of this unity of prosopon, which ought to be understood as existing in both natures, that we read of the Son of Man as having descended from heaven.[2]

---

[1] Contr. Gr., II, pp. 139-140.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 180. The first part of the second quotation *here* was the third passage to which the Palestinian and the Illyrian bishops referred at Chalcedon. See above p. 112.

Severus argues that, in spite of Leo's affirmation of personal unity as is found in certain parts of the Tome, these passages are sufficient to prove that he conceived of Christ as existing in two centres of being. Therefore, the unity of person of which Leo can speak is only a harmonious association that exists between two persons. There are, for instance, according to Leo, two operating natures, namely the man Jesus and the Son of God dwelling in him. Some of the words and deeds ascribed to Christ in the Gospels were of the man Jesus, and some others of the Word of God. "When therefore," contends Severus, "there enter two natures after the union, each nature has its own prosopon, to which the words also join, the divine words being applied separately to the prosopon of God and the human words to the prosopon of man."[1]

Severus has two objections to this view. On the one hand, it was the emphasis of the Nestorian school, but the fathers recognised by the Church had opposed it; and on the other, it divides the one Christ into two centres of being and operation, thereby denying His uniqueness. He quotes several passages from Nestorius, of which we may reproduce here two.

---

[1] Contr. Gr., II, p. 39.

> He who said, "my God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken me," was the human nature, a wise man.[1]
>
> The seed of Abraham, who is of yesterday and today, according to the saying of Paul, is not He who said, "Before Abraham was, I am," and who identified Himself in everything with His brethren.[2]

The non-Chalcedonian theologian quotes a large number of passages from Theodoret also to show that he too taught the same thing. Of these, we shall quote here two as reproduced by Severus. In dealing with our Lord's statement that He did not know the last day, Theodoret writes:

> If the Truth does not lie, God the Word, the creator of that day, He who has fixed it and who will judge the world on it, has not forgotten it. The unchangeable impression of the Father, He has the Father's knowledge. Therefore, ignorance does not belong to God the Word, but to the form of the servant who at that time knew only inasmuch as the Godhead that indwelt Him had revealed.

Again

> Therefore, of those things that were spoken and done, that which is God-befitting ascribe to God, and that which is lowly attribute to the form of the servant, so that we may not fall into the blasphemy of Arius and Eunomius.[3]

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 42.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 70.

[3] *Ibid.*, I, p. 281.

The fathers, on the other hand, argues Severus, were opposed to this view. They had taught taht it was the Same incarnate Word of God who spoke and did both the God-befitting and the man-befitting things. He quotes copiously from the works of the Cappadocians and Cyril to prove his point. Thus Basil wrote, criticising Eunomius:

> If it were God the Son who had said "the Lord created me," He would most certainly have said, "the Father created me," for He does not refer to Him Father anywhere as His Lord; but always as the Father. Therefore, that "He was born" should be taken as referring to God the Son, and that "He created" as referring to the form of the servant. Because of all this, we do not say that He was two, God and man separately; for He is one. But, in contemplation, we conceive the nature of each. For even Peter, in saying that "Christ suffered for us in the flesh," did not take Him to be two.[1]

Severus argues that, for Bssil, there was a distinction between God the Son prior to the Incarnation and the Same during the Incarnation. In the days of His flesh, the Son assumed humility pertaining to the dispensation, and whatever He did and spoke during His earthly life belonged to the latter. This idea, says Severus, is made clear by Basil in his second book against Eunomius, where he wrote:

---

[1] Ibid., II, pp. 112-113.

> Even this idea of the Apostle refers to the hypostasis of the Son which is before the ages. Since the Word is the Same now, it does not mean that it refers to the ousia of God the Word, who, in the beginning, was with God, but [it refers] to Him who emptied Himself in the likeness of the servant, became of the same form with the body of our humility, and was crucified in humility.[1]

Gregory Nazianzen held a view similar to that of Basil, says Severus, and quotes from his first book on the Son:

> The lofty ones ascribe to Godhead, to the nature that transcends suffering and body. But the lowly ones ascribe to the composite one, who emptied Himself for your sake and became incarnate, it is not wrong to say, became man. . . . He who is now being insulted by you, there was a time when He was above you. He who is now man, was not composite. That which He was, He continued to be. That which He was not, He assumed.[2]

In his letter to Cledonius, says Severus, Gregory complained against those who divided the one Christ in these words:

> Who will not be amazed at their learning; for they plainly divide the things that belong to Christ. That He was born, hungered, thirsted, became weary and slept, they assign to the manhood. That He was glorified by the angels, won victory over the tempter, fed people and walked over the surface of the sea, they ascribe to the Godhead.[3]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 110.

[2] Ibid., p. 134.

[3] Ibid., p. 141.

Athanasius also, in his fourth book against the Arians, wrote commenting on the Petrine passage, according to which "Christ died for us in the flesh":

> No one need be offended at these human ascriptions, but rather know that, while the Word is by nature impassible, these refer to the flesh which He assumed; for these belong to the flesh, and the body belongs to the Saviour. He remains as He is by nature impassible, without being affected by them in any way.[1]

Of the many quotations from Cyril, we shall reproduce here just one.

> Therefore, everything, whether the God-befitting ones or the man-befitting ones, belongs to the one Christ. For had not the Word of the Father become man, He would not have spoken as a man like us. If it is true that He partook of flesh and blood like us and identified Himself in everything with His brethren, namely with us, why do they insult greatly the wisdom of the dispensation by lack of understanding, not accepting the human word as well as the lowliness proper to the dispensatory words, being concerned, as they say, to assign to another Son (conceived) by Himself the status of the form of the servant?"[2]

The point of Severus is clear enough. The theology of Leo's Tome does not fit in with that of the Church fathers before Chalcedon, whose teaching he summarises in these words:

> Christ is known one from both, which came together into a natural union. He is

---

[1] Ibid., p. 144.

[2] Ibid., I, pp. 284-285.

> one prosopon, one hypostasis and one nature of the Word incarnate; as also is man, who is made up of body and soul. He is one not by a harmonious association of two persons. That which operates is one, namely God the Word incarnate; He performs the things that befit God as well as the things that befit man, the flesh not being alien to the God-befitting operation. The Word did not work the divine miracles, without being incarnate, neither was the Word external to bodily and human operations and sufferings. For He was incarnate. He who, in His nature, without body, became in the dispensation with body, having united to Himself hypostatically flesh possessing a rational soul. Therefore, in His flesh, which is subject to suffering, He is said to have suffered, ascribing to Himself the passions of the flesh which He united to Himself naturally.[1]

The theology of the Tome, says Severus, does not agree with this Patristic teaching, but it fits in with the views of the Nestorian school.

What, then, about the Chalcedonian Definition of the Faith? According to Severus, the Patristic view of the Person of Christ came to be expressed by means of the phrases, "hypostatic union," "of two natures," "one incarnate nature of God the Word," and "one composite nature." All these, argues Severus, were ignored by Chalcedon. The basis on which he makes this drastic statement needs a brief examination in this context, to which we shall now pass.

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 286-287.

III. OBJECTION TO THE CHALCEDONIAN DEFINITION OF THE FAITH

As we have noted, Severus lived and wrote at a time when Eastern Chalcedonians had begun to interpret the Council's Definition along the lines of the Cyrilline tradition. The attitude of taking the Chalcedonian "in two natures" as nothing but a better way of expressing the idea lying behind "of two natures"[1] came to be expressed by these neo-Alexandrines of the Chalcedonian side. Severus, on the other hand, undertook to oppose this view, and in his work addressed to Nephalius he challenged it in these words:

> That it is not the same to say "of two" and "two natures after the union" even with the addition of "united" /after "two"/, the Council itself testifies. For the minutes contained the following incident. The most excellent and glorious commissioners said, "Dioscorus has stated, 'I accept the "of two natures"; but I do not accept the "in two." The holy archbishop Leo, on the other hand, has affirmed that there are two natures united in the One Son, Only-begotten, our Saviour, without confusion and change. Whom do you follow, holy Leo or Dioscorus?' The pious bishops shouted: 'As Leo, so we believe. Those who disagree are Eutychianists. Leo has affirmed orthodoxy.'"[2]

Severus proceeds to comment on the incident.

---

[1] We have seen Evagrius expressing this view. See above pp. 221-222.

[2] See note p. 342.

> See, how they declared it heretical to affirm "of two natures," and judged it orthodox to say "two united natures"! By this, they prepared the ground to establish "two natures after the union." If, however, they took the two phrases as meaning the same thing, they should have said, "Obviously Dioscorus is contentious and unnecessarily fight about words which have the same meaning. But they knew that from "of two natures" "one composite nature" would follow. Since they were striving to avoid "one incarnate nature of the Word," they accepted "in two natures."[1]

The argument of Severus deserves appreciative understanding. For him, the Antiochene use of the phrase "two natures after the union" had behind it a theological point of view, which was opposed to "the teaching of the fathers." As we have already noted, it conceived of the man Jesus as separate from God the Word, and regarded the union as lying in prosopon. It was this phrase that the Council of Chalcedon declared exclusively orthodox. The Council itself did not make it clear that the phrase was being adopted in a sense different from the way in which it had been used by Nestorius or his associates; neither was there any expression of approval of the Alexandrine phrases. In that situation the only document extolled by the Council, which is to be taken as clarifying the meaning of the phrase was the *Tome* of Leo. Its theology was in no way different from what Nestorius had taught. Therefore, argues Severus, the Council of Chalcedon rejected "the faith of the fathers." So he writes:

---

[1] Ad Nephalium, op. cit., pp. 11-12. Facts about the Council of Chalcedon, which we have surveyed in detail, are such that there is no evidence for the Chalcedonian theory that the Council of 451 had any appreciation for the Alexandrine phrases. In regard to the phrase "one incarnate nature," the leaders of the Council expressed extreme horror; the "of two natures" was definitely replaced by the "in two natures"; when once the "one incarnate nature" is found valueless, the "one composite nature" could not receive any sanction. The only remaining Alexandrine phrase is "hypostatic union." Severus argues that this phrase and the "in two natures" are contradictory to each other. The sixth century Chalcedonians, in order to redeem the Alexandrine phrases, gave a definition to the term "nature" which was opposed to the meaning assigned to it by the Antiochenes. See below pp.

> For the "of two" denies that they remain two; but it makes clear that He is one in composition (σύνθεσις), and that those of which the one has been composed have not been lost; for they are united without confusion. By reason of the excellence of the union, He remains firmly and unchangeably one. . . . If He remained two, they (the natures) were not united, for union is destructive of duality.[1]

This oft-repeated argument becomes clear in the light of the foregoing discussion. However, Chalcedonians are entitled to challenge Severus on three grounds. (a) The Council's Definition maintained that the natures were united. (b) It spoke of the Hypostasis of Christ as one, and therefore the Council affirmed "hypostatic union." And (c) the Definition said that Christ was the same Son of God incarnate. Severus answers these three challenges in several parts of his writings.

---

[1] *Ad Nephalium*, *op. cit.*, p. 12. The same point is made in *Philalethes*, *op. cit.*, p. 169.

In regard to the first, Severus says that Nestorius had maintained, in spite of his opposition to *Theotokos* and of his defence of "two natures after the union," that the natures are united.

In *Ad Nephalium*, he answers the second point in these words.

> You may feel disposed to say that the Council of Chalcedon took the union in the sense of hypostatic union on the ground that, in its Definition, the Council made this statement. "One and the same Christ, Son, Lord, Only-begotten, made known in two natures unconfusedly, unchangeably, inseparably, and indivisibly; the difference of the natures in nowise being removed by reason of the union, but rather each nature preserving its properties, and both concurring into one prosopon and one hypostasis."

Severus now comments on the Chalcedonian statement:

> It is clear to all those who have been brought up and trained in at least some measure of orthodox teaching that to affirm of the one Christ two natures but one hypostasis is contradictory. For he who speaks of one hypostasis has of necessity to affirm one nature.[1]

As for the third, Severus writes in the *Philalethes*:

> Let not any one of the simple-minded be deceived thinking that those who were assembled at Chalcedon were not dividing (the one Christ) because they confessed "One and the same Christ and Son." For

---

[1] *Ad Nephalium*, *op. cit.*, p. 16.

> it was customary with those who were infected with the teaching of Nestorius to speak hypocritically "One and the same Son."[1]

The "one hypostasis" of Chalcedon, argues Severus, meant only one prosopon, and quotes from Theodoret's letter to John of Agae to prove his point.[2]

The argument of Severus is this. In the historical context of the Council of Chalcedon, the phrase "in two natures" meant only in two persons. This was the teaching of the Nestorian school; for they spoke of Christ as two persons expressing themselves in an unbroken and unceasing harmony of will and operation. They had no value for a united inner ego in Christ. In declaring that phrase exclusively orthodox, the Council enforced the "Nestorian heresy" on the Church. There was nothing either in the Definition of the Council or in the Tome of Leo which Nestorius had not taught. So Severus accused Chalcedonians of his day of inconsistency.

---

[1] *Philalethes*, *op. cit.*, p. 162.

[2] John of Agae seems to have been an Antiochene extremist who found the Chalcedonian Definition unacceptable because it contained "one hypostasis." Theodoret wrote to him defending the Council on this point by arguing that, for the Council, the word meant only *prosopon*.

Sellers refers to this incident, and says that "Theodoret tried to convince him that he was mistaken in thinking that 'one *hypostasis*' meant 'one *substantia*.'" (*op. cit.*, p. 213, n. 2). Sellers, however, does not say what the word meant for Theodoret, in spite of the fact that Severus, on whose authority he bases his statement, clearly brings it out. According to Severus, Theodoret wrote to John of Agae: "Therefore, those who mentioned two natures (affirmed) unconfused union. It is also clear that they did not take 'one *hypostasis*' either in the sense of *ousia* or of *nature*, but in that of *prosopon*." Again, "Therefore, 'one *hypostasis*' was affirmed by the holy Synod, as I said, not taking the word *hypostasis* in the sense of *nature*, but of *prosopon*. This is clear from the Definition; *prosopon* and *hypostasis* are allied terms." (*Philalethes*, *op. cit.*, pp. 177-178.)

Whether or not the Alexandrine sympathisers present at Chalcedon would have agreed with Theodoret, the point is clear. On every issue the Council left ideas vague enough for the Antiochenes to make their assertions.

> If you affirm two inseparable and united natures after the union, why do you call Nestorius a man lacking in understanding, and why do you reproach hypocritically a union which consists in an equality of honour and will? For you embrace the offsprings of such a union, I mean, two natures after the union.[1]

---

[1] Contr. Gr., I, p. 125. The fact that Severus had no appreciation for the teaching of the Nestorian school, has to be granted. At the same time, his accusation against Chalcedon that there was no difference between its theology and the teaching of Nestorius, is significant. That Nestorius himself expressed his willingness to accept the Tome of Leo and the decision of the Home Synod of Constantinople in the case of Eutyches (Loofs: Nestorius, p. 22), is an added evidence in support of the Severian judgment that the Council of Chalcedon was actually opposed to the Alexandrine theological tradition.

Chapter Three

"The One Incarnate Nature of God the Word"

We have seen in the last chapter that Severus rejected the Chalcedonian phrase "in two natures" on the ground that it was opposed to the Alexandrine phrases "of two natures," "hypostatic union," "one incarnate nature" and "one composite (σύνθετος) nature" as well as to the theological emphasis lying behind them. In the present chapter we have to examine how he expounded the theological idea conserved by these phrases, and whether he actually excluded "Eutychianism" and the teaching of Julian of Halicarnassus. The one phrase, for using which the Antiochenes had never ceased from denouncing Cyril as a heretic, and on the basis of which Chalcedonians throughout the centuries have characterised the non-Chalcedonian position as Monophysite is "one incarnate nature of God the Word." Therefore, what it meant for Severus is of paramount importance for this study.

That this phrase was originally coined by Apollinarius himself or one of his disciples need not be disputed.[1] The unorthodox origin of a term, however, is no valid reason why it should not be used by orthodox theologians on the strength of a fresh definition of its meaning. The Nicene term "homoousios," for instance, had been part of the Valentinian vocabulary,[1] and the Council of Antioch which condemned Paul of Samosata in 267 or 268 had explicitly excluded it. Therefore, in regard to a term, the important point is the meaning given to it and the theological need for that meaning to be pressed. In the fifth century the phrase "one incarnate nature of God the Word" came to be regarded as part of Athanasian legacy to Christian thought, and Cyril adopted it as an indispensable terminological tool to express his idea of the Person of Christ. Though both the Home Synod of Constantinople and the Council of Chalcedon had definitely excluded it, sixth century defenders of Chalcedon began to claim it and to place it alongside of the Council's phrase "in two natures"[2] regarding it as valuable to keep out "Nestorianism." Non-Chalcedonians, on the other hand, maintained that the two phrases contradicted each other in meaning, and that therefore they would not go together.

---

[1] For a summary treatment of this point, see R. V. Sellers: Two Ancient Christologies, p. 89, esp. n. 2.

---

[1] As G. L. Prestige says, "According to Valentinians (ap. Iren. haer, I.5.1), Achamoth, the abortive and degenerate fruit of the final aeon in the divine Absolute (pleroma), was homoousios with angelic ("spiritual") beings, and thus superior to the physical creation" (God in Patristic Thought, p. 197).

[2] For a fuller discussion of this point, see below pp. 417-418.

In his work against the Grammarian, Severus refers, at the beginning of the book, to a passage from the former's treatise against the non-Chalcedonians, and proceeds to answer the charge it contained.

> The holy Synod of Chalcedon, he [the Grammarian] says, was concerned to anathematise Eutyches and those who strive zealously to declare his teaching from the centre of the Sanctuary--men who disgracefully proclaim that the Godhead and the flesh of Christ were one ousia and one nature. They are not ashamed to contradict Gregory the wonder-worker who, in the eleventh anathematism, had stated: If any one says that the flesh of Christ is of the same ousia with Godhead, and does not confess that the Same who is God, in the likeness of God before the ages, emptied Himself, as it is written, and assumed the likeness of the servant, let him be anathema.[1]

Severus goes on to challenge the Grammarian on this point.

> Your charge seems to be directed against me, as though, in many places of my writing, I affirmed, in my own words, that the body animated with a rational soul, assumed from Mary the Virgin *Theotokos*, which God the Word united to Himself, was of the same substance with Him.[2]

As applied to his section of the Church, says Severus, the Grammarian should show, for the establishment of his charge, that the Council of Eastern bishops[1] also maintained the same view of the matter. But the fact is, argues Severus, that the Council expressed itself very clearly in opposition to

---

[1] Contr. Gr., I, p. 20. This was a quotation from a work falsely ascribed to Gregory.

[2] *Ibid*., p. 21.

> confusion, mixture, change, mingling of substances and phantasy. It excluded, on the opposite extreme, division and separation of the divine Incarnation. The assembled bishops anathematised with all their minds and mouths those who hold these views. The same things were written by the holy Synod of Egypt also in the same words. Thus not once or twice, but many times, the two sides [those under the sees of Antioch and Alexandria] wrote each other. In unison they confessed Christ to be God the Word who was truly made man and became incarnate, having assumed flesh of the same substance with us animated with a rational soul, and having identified Himself with all men in everything except sin. In this way, [they confessed that] the Same who is of the same substance with the Father and the Holy Spirit in the Godhead is also of the same substance with us in the manhood.[2]

Therefore, asks Severus,

> Are you not culpable before the judgment of God that you wrote such calumny[3] against two holy synods, without producing a single piece of evidence.[4]

---

[1] As we have already noted, the Grammarian published his work against the non-Chalcedonians subsequent to the Council of Tyre. The reference here is to that Council.

[2] Contr. Gr., I, pp. 21-22.

[3] Lebon's edition of Contra Grammaticum has here ܪܫܥܐ which is taken here as ܪܘܫܥܐ in order to make any real sense of the sentence.

[4] Contr. Gr., I, p. 23. Therefore, the charge of "Eutychianism" against the non-Chalcedonians was forcibly

Now the important question is, How did Severus understand the phrase "one incarnate nature of God the Word." In the Philalethes, he answers this question in these words.

> When they the fathers spoke of "one nature of God the Word," they made it clear that by becoming incarnate the Word did not abandon His nature, but that He remained in His perfection without change and deviation; for He did not undergo any loss or diminution in His Hypostasis. When they said that He "became incarnate," they affirmed that the flesh was nothing but flesh, and that it did not come into being by itself apart from union with the Word. Therefore, it is just to say that the Word was simple, not composite, before the ages. When He willed to assume our likeness without sin, the flesh was brought into being, but not separately. While signifying the lofty union, the words "became incarnate" refer to the assumption of the

---

challenged by the Council's critics. Chalcedonians, on the other hand, went on making the charge in spite of this challenge. This fact needs a word of explanation. We have already referred to the Chalcedonian work consisting of excerpts from the writings of Cyril. In his Contra Grammaticum, Severus mentions both the work of the Grammarian and a publication by John of Seythopolis (Vol. II, p. 286). Both these, he says, were distributed only among Chalcedonians, and it was by continued efforts and in the course of some time that he was able to secure certain fragments from the work of John of Seythopolis. However, he got a complete copy of the work of the Grammarian. His Contra Grammaticum is a detailed refutation of the Grammarian, in the course of which he evaluates critically the point of view of John of Seythopolis also. In the light of the statement of Severus, we can say that the Chalcedonian works were primarily intended to strengthen the adherents of the Council in the face of denunciation from its critics, and that the authors and publishers were not concerned to represent the non-Chalcedonian position accurately.

> flesh from the Virgin, which was not separate by itself; so that from two natures, namely Godhead and manhood, one Christ came forth from Mary. The Same is known to be at once God and man; He is of the same substance with the Father in the Godhead and He Himself is of the same substance with us men in the manhood.[1]

There are two emphases in this explanation. On the one hand, it is God the Son Himself that assumed a real and perfect manhood; and on the other, when the Son assumed this dispensation, He took up an incarnate state, whereby He who was "simple" became "composite." These two ideas need a further clarification. In regard to the first, Severus says that the fathers have made a distinction between the Son before the incarnation and the same Son after incarnation. As for the second, there was a coming together of two natures.

Severus treats the distinction between the pre-incarnation Son and the incarnate Son on the strength of ideas derived mainly from the Cappadocian fathers. In their defence of the Nicene Faith against the Arian Eunomius, they had to answer how the Son, if He was coequal with the Father, could be reported to have said words which implied that He was lower in status than God the Father. This they did, not by ascribing lowly words and deeds to the human nature, but by viewing the incarnate state as a dispensation of the Son and assigning them to the Son become man. Severus argues that they were careful to avoid the notion of a division in the incarnate Son. Thus, having quoted several passages from Basil dealing with this subject, Severus comments:

---

[1] Philalethes, op. cit., p. 139.

> Therefore, the holy Basil affirms of Him who became incarnate and was made man that He is indivisibly one, and that everything which belongs to the incarnation is His, whether they be words or deeds. But he separates the time of the incarnation from the time before the incarnation, and accepts the fact of a distinction between the advent of the Word in the flesh and His ministry on the one hand, and the unincarnate Word prior to that on the other. In this way he said that the lowly things are not applicable to Godhead, but to the incarnation.[1]

Again

> He Basil separates the times, but does not divide the incarnate, nor does he separate God the Word from His flesh animated with a rational soul into a duality of natures after the union.[2]

We have now to proceed to the second idea, namely the incarnate state of the Son. In the incarnate state, the Son who was before the ages "simple" became "composite" by the assumption of a human nature. Since into the formation of this new state both Godhead and manhood concurred,

---

[1] Contr. Gr., II, p. 115.

[2] Ibid., p. 116. Severus himself admits that the Cappadocians had not fixed the phrase "one incarnate nature" as normative. His point is that they had not separated the two natures after the union, and that what they had endeavored to emphasise is conserved by his section of the Church.

Jesus Christ is at once God and man. The phrases "of two natures," "hypostatic union," "one incarnate nature" and "one composite nature" are meant to conserve this idea. In this context the phrases "of two natures," "hypostatic union" and "one composite nature" need a brief explanation.

I. "OF TWO NATURES"

Severus has shown that for the Antiochenes, the term "nature" meant "hypostasis." Against the background of this way of thinking, we can understand the horror the statement of Eutyches at his trial may have produced in the minds of Antiochenes. For, as we have noted, he had stated that the natures before the union were two, but after the union one. When "nature" is taken in the sense of "hypostasis," these words could very well be regarded as having proceeded from an affirmation that there existed prior to the incarnation a human hypostasis which God the Son assumed. This must have been the reason why Eutyches was accused of having maintained that the body of our Lord had come from heaven. As we have seen, Eutyches denied this charge and made it clear in his statement of the Faith that this is not what he meant.[1] What, then, did the phrase "of two natures" mean for Severus?

---

[1] It may well be that, in his ignorance, Eutyches, while trying to affirm the ἐκ δύο φύσεων , thought that he could adapt it and say δύο φύσεις πρὸ τῆς ἑνώσεως.

He deals with this subject in many places of his writings. We shall reproduce here a passage that brings out his view clearly. As the context of the passage is helpful for an understanding of his idea, we shall refer to it first. In the Contra Grammaticum he quotes this statement from the Definitio of Chalcedon.

> And it [the Council] withstands those who imagine a mixture or confusion of the two natures of Christ, and it drives away those who fancy that the form of the servant, taken by Him of us, is of a heavenly or different nature; and it anathematises those who imagine two natures of the Lord before the union, but fashion anew one nature after the union.[1]

Commenting on the statement, Severus asks why, in order to exclude the wrong ideas mentioned here, the phrases "of two natures" and "one incarnate nature" were considered inadequate. Had not the fathers kept out such notions on the strength of these phrases and without dividing the one Christ into two natures? Julius of Rome, for instance, had said that "in Him the creature is in union with the uncreated, and the uncreated in a σύνθεσις with the created, one nature from both having been brought into being."[2] Cyril also, in his treatise on Christ is One, had written, "Who is so mad and unlearned as to think either that the divine nature of the Word was changed into something that He was not, or that the flesh was converted to the Word? This is not possible. But we say that the Son is one, and that His nature is one, though it is clear that He assumed flesh animated with a rational soul."[1] Therefore, argues Severus, the phrases "of two natures" and "one incarnate nature" are adequate to exclude the notions which Chalcedon wanted to keep out.

---

[1] Contr. Gr., II, p. 237.

[2] That this quotation was taken from a collection of pseudonymous writings ascribed to earlier theologians and Church fathers does not answer Severus, for both sides regarded such passages as genuine.

As for the expression "two natures before the union," Severus continues,

> no one who has thought correctly has ever affirmed it even in fancy. For before the union and the incarnation, the Word was simple, not composite (σύνθετος), invisible in ousia and without body or material form. He was co-eternal with the Father and the Holy Spirit. But when He willed to become man for us, while remaining God unchangeably, He dwelt, as it is written, in the Virgin Theotokos inexplicably. Of her and of the Holy Spirit, He united to Himself by the σύνθεσις of a natural union flesh possessing soul and mind, which is of the same substance with us. Therefore, we speak of the union as hypostatic; for it was in union with the Word, who is before the ages, that the flesh was formed and came to be (ܐܠܐ ܒܚܕܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܡ ܡܠܬܐ ܕܩܕܡ ܥܠܡܐ ܐܬܓܒܠ ܗܘ ܒܣܪܐ ܘܐܬܒܪܝ ܘܗܘܐ ܠܗ); and, in concurrence, it the flesh received with Him concreteness into the union (ܘܡܬܩܢܡܢܘܬܐ ܢܣܒ ܒܣܪܐ ܥܡܗ ܩܢܘܡܐ ܠܚܕܝܘܬܐ).[2] In this

---

[1] Contr. Gr., II, pp. 237-238.

[2] Lebon's edition has ܘܡܬܩܢܡܢܘܬܐ ܢܣܒ ܥܡܗ ܒܣܪܐ ܕܩܢܘܡܐ ܠܚܕܝܘܬܐ (p. 240). Literally this would mean,

> way, from two, namely Godhead and manhood, Christ is known indivisibly one Emmanuel. He was conceived and born in the flesh, like soul in every man which is born with body. It is of a different substance from the latter, and yet [man] is completed into one nature and one hypostasis from both. In the same way, the Word of God, as it is written, partook of flesh and blood, and received our likeness in everything except sin. If, therefore, the Word was, before the union and the incarnation, simple and without body and after the incarnation one from both, how can they fancy two natures before the union?

Severus, then, goes on to say that the affirmation of two natures before the union is consonant with the teaching of Nestorius. For it was the Nestorian school that had conceived of a child as having been formed in the womb of Mary prior to the union.[1] On the other hand, the Council of Chalcedon was wrong in ascribing to the phrase "of two natures" the notions of "confusion" and "mixture."

The phrase "two natures before the union" is objectionable in two ways. One: It can mean that the human nature had been individuated even before the Incarnation in a sense like that in which Origen maintained prior union of the Word and a pre-existent human spirit. By making it clear that the flesh of our Lord was assumed from the flesh of the Virgin, Eutyches had excluded any

---

"and in concurrence it (the flesh) received with concreteness into the union," and the verb "received" remains without an object. So the above emendation is suggested.

[1] Contr. Gr., II, pp. 239-241.

such interpretation as applied to the Lord's body, during his trial at Constantinople in 448. It is to be assumed that he meant to deny any pre-existent human person. Eutyches had also denied that the body of Christ had come down from heaven. Therefore, this way of taking the phrase cannot be laid to the charge even of Eutyches.

Two: It can mean that the human ousia had received concretion before the union. This was the emphasis of the Nestorian school. Severus excludes this idea in many places of his writings. As we shall see later, in endeavouring to fix the meaning of ousia on physis, both the Grammarian and Leontius of Byzantium must have been moved by a desire to keep out this idea. On this point Severus writes to Oecumenius:

> Though the Hypostasis of God the Word existed before, or rather was before all ages and times, being eternally with God the Father and the Holy Spirit, yet still the flesh possessing a rational soul which He united to Himself did not exist before the union with Him, nor was a distinct prosopon assigned to it.[1]

Again in one of his Homilies, he writes:

> For it is not that a child was formed at first in the womb of the Virgin and immediately God the Word associated Himself with it by means of a union of will and a conjunction of love. If it were so, the Word did not become incarnate, nor did He become man unchangeably; but only associated Himself with the prosopon of a man.[2]

---

[1] Patr. Or., XII, pp. 190-191. [2] Ibid., VIII, p. 221.

The ideas affirmed in these passages are again and again maintained by Severus, and we shall be referring to a few more of them in the course of this study. On the strength of the above passages we can say that for Severus there is a real incarnation of God the Son in the Person of Jesus Christ; for God assumed a human nature or a human hypostasis. However, this human hypostasis had not come into being before the incarnation. It was only at the moment when God willed to accomplish once for all His redemptive work for the entire human race that God the Word assumed manhood. The manhood was created anew from the Virgin by the operation of the Holy Spirit, and it had its concrete being only in union with the Son. The phrase "of two natures" means primarily the idea that there was a real coming together of Godhead and manhood in the one Person of Jesus Christ. It conserves another idea, which we shall try to bring out later.

The purpose, therefore, of the phrase "of two natures" was not to deny the reality of either of the two natures, but to affirm it without falling into the danger of dividing the one Son into two centres of being and operation. As we have seen, the Alexandrines before Chalcedon and the non-Chalcedonians subsequently were opposed to a view of Christ which conceived of Him as two concrete beings brought together into a union that lay in prosopon.

It is this concern that moved the former to oppose the Antiochene phrase "two natures after the union" and the latter to keep out the Chalcedonian phrase "in two natures."

II. "HYPOSTATIC UNION"

That the Son of God is an eternal Hypostasis, and that He assumed a redemptive dispensation for the entire human race, was an affirmation on which there was no dispute between either the Antiochenes and the Alexandrines, or the Chalcedonians and the non-Chalcedonians. Therefore, for all parties, one of the two natures was God the Word.

What, then, was the human nature? For the Antiochenes, as Severus has shown, it was a human hypostasis. What it meant for Leo or for the Council of Chalcedon was not made clear. Sixth century defenders of Chalcedon, as we shall see later, took the term "nature," with reference to Christ's humanity, in the sense of ousia. Severus, on the other hand, took it in the sense of hypostasis.[1]

Therefore, "hypostatic union" meant for Severus, a union of the divine Hypostasis of God the Son with a human hypostasis, which came into concrete being only in union with God the Word. The Antiochenes had opposed this phrase, and, as we have seen, even after Chalcedon, Theodoret interpreted the Council's affirmation of "one hypostasis" in the sense of "one prosopon." The point, therefore, of the phrase "hypostatic union" was that it conserved an idea which the Antiochene phrase "prosopic union" could not comprehend. Cyril himself had insisted on the former in opposition to the Antiochene assertion of a union of *prosopa*.

---

[1] See below pp. 425f.

We have already noted that "*prosopon*" does not refer to "inner ego," but that *hypostasis* does. Since the entire ousia in its fulness is individuated in the hypostasis, it is the ousia itself in concrete existence. Therefore, everything that goes with the ousia is fully real in the hypostasis. When we say that there was in Christ a hypostatic union of God the Word with a human hypostasis, and that His Hypostasis is one, it means that in Him there is a coming together (συνοδος) of everything that Godhead means as well as of everything that manhood means. This coming together of the two, namely Godhead and manhood, is "hypostatic union." Leo's *Tome*, argues Severus, did not see any need for this emphasis, and the Antiochenes had rejected the phrase, criticising its defenders as Apollinarian heretics. The very emphasis of the Antiochenes as well as of Leo's *Tome* that each nature performed what is proper to it is opposed to the theological idea for which the phrase "hypostatic union" is a terminological tool. Since Chalcedon declared orthodox both the *Tome* and the Antiochene phrase "in two natures," the Council also excluded a cardinal emphasis of Christian orthodoxy.

III. "ONE COMPOSITE NATURE"

Our discussion thus far will make clear how the phrases "of two natures," "hypostatic union," "one incarnate nature" and "one composite nature" are linked up one with another in a highly subtle theological pattern of thinking. When it is affirmed that Christ's inner ego was a unity, an emphasis basic to all these phrases, and that both the divine and the human words and deeds came forth from that inner ego, it does not mean that the manhood had no part in them; for the inner ego itself was formed by the concurrence of both Godhead and manhood. It is to conserve this idea that Severus defended the composite (σύνθετος) character of Christ's inner ego. Thus, in treating the meaning of the phrase "of two natures," Severus writes in his work against the Grammarian:

> From both He was inexplicably completed as one in composition (σύνθεσις). The natures and the hypostases of which He has been constituted are perceived irreducibly and unchangeably in the union. But it is not possible to recognise prosopon for each one of them, because they did not come into being dividedly either in specific concretion or in duality. For He is one Hypostasis from both, and one Prosopon conjointly, and one nature of God the Word incarnate.[1]

---

[1] Contr. Gr., I, p. 187.

We have seen thus far that Severus defended the Alexandrine phrases for conserving the principle that Christ's inner ego was a unity. If it was a unity, did manhood have a real place and function in it? For an understanding of Severus' answer to this question, we have to take up his view of the properties of the natures.

The Properties of the Natures

The charge against the non-Chalcedonian position from the time of the Council is that it cannot give expression to the Christian conviction that Jesus Christ was fully man. This, in fact, was the Antiochene accusation against the Alexandrine theological thinking. We have to examine in this context how far this charge is valid.

As we have seen, Severus maintained that a human hypostasis had gone into the formation of the "one incarnate nature of God the Word." So there is no questioning the fact that for him, God assumed the fulness of humanity in its reality and perfection. This affirmation, in fact, is not sufficient for a sound Christology. And, as Severus quotes from the work of the Grammarian, the latter raised that point.

> The Grammarian: But the opponent might be saying that before the union there was difference [i.e. between the natures]; but after the union not at all.

To hold that there was difference between the natures before the union, argues the Grammarian, one has to conceive of a man first, and regard the union as a subsequent indwelling of God in an already existing man. This was the teaching of Nestorius.

> But perhaps they say that there are two natures in the union, but after the union one. We shall ask those who think in this way whether the "after the union" was different from "at the union." If they say that it is, let them say in what way. Do they mean to say that the union has annulled and dissolved itself already, like those who corrupt the Scriptures and maintain that God the Word put away the flesh after the ascension? . . . If they are afraid of saying this lest they be accused of divesting God the Word of the flesh, they might say that the union stands, but one nature alone is complete. To this we say that as long as the union remains, most definitely the two natures remain in union. Otherwise it is not union.[1]

The points raised here are mainly two. One: the Grammarian is probably taking seriously the statement of Eutyches to which we have referred, and tries to ascribe it to the non-Chalcedonian position. We have already dealt with the Severian answer to this point. Two: Do the Alexandrine phrases mean only that at the moment of the union the two natures came together, and from then on one nature alone remained? The answer of Severus was in these words.

---

[1] Contr. Gr., I, pp. 234-235.

> Before the union and the incarnation, the Word was simple, not incarnate, nor composite. But when He mercifully willed in the dispensation to become man unchangeably along with being what He was, then He was called Christ and Emmanuel, the name being taken from the act, and He became with us, by reason of the fact that He united to Himself hypostatically flesh which was of the same substance with us and which was animated with a rational and intelligent soul. The flesh had not come into being or had been formed already; but in the union with Him it [the flesh] came into being inexplicably, so that the conception, formation, growth, gradual development and birth might be of the incarnate Word. On account of the essential union of the flesh, for which it is natural to be conceived and formed, to grow and be born, though He showed it to be beyond the laws of nature because it happened from the Virgin . . . and from the Holy Spirit . . . , he who calls Him *Christ*, after the union, most certainly signifies Him.[1]

For Severus, the word "Chirst" signifies the fact of the union. Therefore, the name *Christ* indicates that He is God incarnate. Even in the incarnate state there was no change of either nature into the other. Therefore, says Severus, while thinking of Christ, we can in our minds distinguish those out of which is Christ, and see a natural coming together (συνοδος) of two (natures), Godhead and manhood. But along with the thought of distinction, there enters the idea of union which enjoins on us to know the difference of the natures and not to go beyond that. The thought of union does not permit a division into two,

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 236.

> though those from which is the union remain without diminution and without change. They came to be in composition (σύνθεσις), and not in specific concretion, and therefore they cannot be counted two. From both there is completed one nature and one hypostasis of the Word incarnate. For it is not of "simple" objects alone that the word "one" is spoken, but it is used also of beings that came together in composition.[1]

The point which Severus tries to make is clear. His objection to the Chalcedonian phrase "in two natures" is not based on a view of Christ which does not recognise in Him full humanity after the union. On the other hand, his concern is to emphasise the union of the two natures. The human hypostasis became concrete for the first time in the union. After the moment of the union also it has its reality in the one Christ. In regard to the Grammarian's statement that "the two natures remain in the union," Severus says that Cyril's teaching on this point was different. For, in replying to Theodoret's criticism of his tenth anathematism, he had said:

> If the union is real, most certainly they are not two; but Christ is known one and unique from both.[2]

The difference between the natures is also to be regarded as real, not merely before the union, but after the union also. It is to conserve this idea that Severus, following Cyril, maintains the principle of recognising the difference of the natures in Contemplation. This, however, does not mean that therefore we can speak of certain words or deeds as exclusively of one nature and certain others as of the other nature. All words and deeds, as we have already noted, came forth from the one incarnate Person into whom both natures concurred.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 238.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 244.

We shall now pass on to bring out an idea which Severus has made on the strength of the phrase "of two natures." We can find this in the preceding passages as well as in one of his letters to Sergius, the Grammarian, whom we have mentioned earlier. (He must be distinguished from his namesake of the Chalcedonian party, against whom Severus wrote his Contra Grammaticum.) An opponent of Chalcedon, this Sergius expressed in a letter a point of view which was a clear testimony to the misleading sense in which the phrase "one incarnate nature" could be taken. His view, as is found in his first letter, may be summarised in this way.

> Godhead and flesh are two ousias. Eternality is the property of the former, and corruptibility that of the latter. It is true that, in the incarnation, neither of them changed into the other. But the invisible God became visible. In becoming man, the flesh was born supernaturally, and it did not see corruption. Therefore, by

> reason of the union, human property[1] was passed over, and it is better to say that there was one property. Why then do we say that there were two properties?[2]

The letter was not intended to assert a theological point of view, but to raise a question which the troubled writer wished to get cleared from the answer of the learned theologian. The answer of Severus was courteous and graceful. He started by making it clear that the affirmation of a difference of properties was the teaching of the fathers. The natures, of which is the one Christ, they have maintained, are different.

> For one is uncreated, and the other created; one is visible, and the other invisible; one is tangible, and the other intangible. But it is while the difference in the properties of the natures of which is the one Christ remain without confusion that the Word of life is said to have become visible and tangible.[3]

What Severus affirms here is not merely that Godhead and manhood were different one from the other before the union; but that even after the union the difference of the two natures is preserved.

> When we think of the Emmanuel and contemplate Godhead and manhood, we shall see that each of them is not only different from the other, but that they are remote from each other and sharply distinct. Moreover, when the union

---

[1] "Property" is here used in its original sense: a distinctive and indispensable peculiarity.

[2] _Ad Nephalium_, pp. 71-72. [3] _Ibid._, pp. 74-75.

> of both is confessed, the difference signifying the natures of which is the one Christ does not disappear, though by reason of the hypostatic union division is discarded.[1]

Therefore, the properties of both natures remain in the one Christ, so that "the Word may be recognised in the properties of the flesh, and the human properties may come to belong to the Word and the properties of the Word to the flesh."[2]

> When we anathematise those who affirm of the Emmanuel two natures after the union and their operations as well as properties, it is not for speaking of natures or operations or properties that we place them under condemnation; but for saying two natures after the union and assigning the operations and properties to each of them, thereby dividing them between the natures.[3]

On the strength of this statement, we can say that for Severus, there are two natures and that they are two hypostases;[4] but, as we have seen earlier, the human nature came into being only in union with the divine. By reason of the union, when it came into being, it became the human nature of God the Word. Because of this, there was an interchange of properties between the natures, whereby the human nature is not merely human, nor is the divine nature merely divine.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 77.

[2] Ibid., p. 79.

[3] Ibid., p. 80.

[4] See below, pp. 425f.

Severus now proceeds to explain the status of the human nature by means of the body-soul analogy.

> The operations of a man like us have two aspects--the mental and the physical. Before he does anything, man thinks in his mind and forms an idea. This is the mental aspect of human action. Then he puts out the idea concretely, say in building a city, house, or ship; this is physical. But it is one man composed of body and soul that does them both, and the operation is also one. Those things , however, that are being done are mental and physical. In the same way, the Emmanuel also should be understood. He who acts is one, God the Word incarnate. The operating power is one too. But the things done are different, and they are accomplished by the one operation. To walk bodily on earth, for instance, and to move from place to place, is human. To raise the maimed and command them to run, is most certainly God-befitting. However, the Word incarnate is one, and His operation is also one; for He did them both. Because of the fact that the things done are different, we do not say that two natures did them; for, as we have said, God the Word incarnate did them both. Just as no one should divide the Word from the flesh, so also no one should divide the operations. Even in regard to the words, we recognise difference; some are God-befitting, and some human; but the Word incarnate spoke them both.[1]

Severus, then, goes on to say that the Tome of Leo is opposed to this principle.

This passage, taken along with the statements already reproduced is a clear proof that Severus did not take the Alexandrine phrases in any "Eutychian" sense. In fact, this last passage was written by him to a man whose query was based on a "Eutychian" understanding of the Person of Christ. The non-Chalcedonian theologian wrote him three letters, and made it clear to him that his question was opposed to the teaching of the fathers. In the end, this Grammarian wrote his third letter to the Patriarch, indicating his rejection of Manes, Apollinarius and Eutyches as well as of the Council of Chalcedon.[1] In it he says that he has to withstand two enemies; those who accept the Council on the one hand, and those who maintain docetism on the other. By quoting a number of passages from the writings of Severus himself, intended to exclude both Chalcedon and "Eutychianism," he expressed himself on the side of the Patriarch.[2] This incident proves the fact that Severus did not only oppose the Council of Chalcedon, but also exerted his influence against the dissemination of "Eutychian" views in the Church.

---

[1] Ad Nephalium, pp. 82-83.

The emphasis of Severus may be put in this way. The phrase "of two natures" means more than an affirmation that at the time of the union there was a concurrence of

---

[1] For the letter, see Ad Nephalium, pp. 177-187.

[2] In his reference to Sergius the Grammarian, Sellers does not show a knowledge of this side of the story. On the other hand, he seems to base his view of Sergius on the strength of the man's earlier letters (op. cit., p. 272, n. 3). In the light of the third letter, the two earlier ones have to be taken as intended to raise a doubt.

Godhead and manhood. It means also that at every moment in the life of our Lord there was this concurrence. In other words, "of two natures" refers both to the time of the union and to the time after the union. He is, therefore, "of two natures" at every moment of His life after the union. In this way, Severus can speak of the manhood of Christ as absolutely real and dynamic. Since, however, the union has brought into being a united nature or hypostasis, he does not regard the manhood as performing what is merely human, either independently or in communion with the divine nature; but he is most definite that the manhood concurred with the divine nature both in the formation of Christ's inner ego and in His life at every moment ever after. Thus Severus can say that in every word which Christ spoke and in every deed that He performed the manhood had its part to play. While letting the manhood exercise its creaturely freedom, the Godhead assumed as Its own the role that the manhood fulfilled. This happened both ways; for the manhood also, without losing its character, came to be invested with divine glory.

The dynamic character of Christ's manhood is still clearly stated by Severus in his opposition to Julian of Halicarnassus, and that subject needs a brief treatment in this context. In his second letter to Severus, Julian expressed his view in these words:

> And, while we confess Him, who by His stripes healed all men, to be passible, yet we also know Him to be raised and exalted above passions; and, if He is mortal, yet we also confess that He trampled on death, and gave life to mortals through His death.[1]

Christ suffered and died for the human race, and gave life to mortals. Therefore, the suffering and death of Christ were not the result of any innate necessity on the part of the Redeemer's manhood. On the other hand, His passions and death were real, but they were voluntarily chosen by Him in order to vouchsafe to us incorruptibility by means of the resurrection. So Julian wrote that Christ

> participated with us in these voluntary and natural passions, of which some people speak as corruption, so that, in order to prepare incorruption for our body by means of resurrection, even in this life He assumed incorruptibility.[2]

Therefore,

> He who says of Christ that He is subject to change or deviation, and does not confess that He is unchangeable in spirit and incorruptible in the flesh, as it is written, let him be anathema.[3]

Since the body of Christ is incorruptible, there was no difference between His pre-resurrection body and the post-resurrection body.

---

[1] Zacharias of Mitylene, op. cit., p. 236.

[2] Quoted by Severus in his work against Julian, I, p. 31 (MS British Museum 12158.)

[3] Ibid., I, p. 35.

> That body, as it was when it suffered, rose without any change on the third day.[1]

This does not mean that Christ's manhood was not our manhood, or that the suffering and death were unreal.

> Therefore, we confess that in His body which is from us and which is of the same nature with us, the Lord voluntarily suffered in reality. We do not affirm that it was out of necessity of nature that He came down to this. For, as Peter says, Christ suffered for us in the flesh. He who suffers for us, does not subject Himself, but liberates others, without being under necessity. Again, he who hears that Christ suffered for us in the flesh should not think that He suffered for Himself. If He were subject to a natural necessity to suffer and to die, He would most certainly have sought His own liberation.[2]

Julian answers two questions which his critics might raise against this way of thinking. On the one hand, if Christ's manhood is of the same substance with ours, how can it be incorruptible; and on the other, what is meant by saying that Christ is of the same substance with us. Severus quotes[3] a long passage from the work of Julian, which may be summarised in this way. Corruptibility is not part of essential manhood; for it is an accident that happened to be part of human nature in this world, on account of the fall. Christ assumed from Mary essential manhood. In order to show that this is possible, Julian refers to an illustration. Children born of blind parents, or parents defective in any other way, can be free from the infirmity of their progenitors. So Christ was born as man without the disabilities of the fall.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, I, p. 38.

[2] *Ibid.*, II, p. 3.

[3] *Ibid.*, I, p. 30.

As for the affirmation that Christ is of the same substance with us, Julian writes:

> By the phrase "of the same nature with us" we do not refer to passibility, but to the fact that He is of the same ousia. Thus though He is impassible and incorruptible, He is of the same nature with ours, because He is from the same nature; not because He voluntarily suffered.[1]

Christ's manhood, for Julian, is incorruptible, because God the Word assumed essential manhood. Since He became man in order to grant immortality and incorruptibility to the human race, as man, Christ suffered passion and death. But neither passion nor death was necessary for the manhood which God the Word assumed, because it had already obtained the status of manhood as it ought to be.

This view did not make a confusion between the two natures. And Julian may have meant to say that the passion and death which Christ underwent were felt by His body as well as by His soul. This feeling itself was possible, because He chose to have it as a vicarious act of participation in human suffering, not because His manhood itself was involved in it. Severus criticised Julian's theory in these words:

---

[1] Ibid., I, p. 26.

> He who did not suffer in the flesh like us without sin, and He who is "of the same substance with us," as you say, not because He is passible, how is it possible for Him to participate in suffering at all ? It must, therefore, most certainly be in phantasy, not in reality.[1]

The point raised by Severus is cogent. If the manhood of Christ were unfallen manhood, without an experience of estrangement from God, it cannot have suffered the pain involved in passions with any reality. At best, it may have felt that something was happening, without realising its nature. So Severus asks Julian:

> How is it possible that He who is impassible and immortal underwent hunger, thirst and fatigue from journeying, which signify a real human life and intercourse with men, by means of which God the Word voluntarily identified Himself with us without change and phantasy, and became man in reality?[2]

How, then, did Severus maintain the reality of Christ's suffering and death? Basic to his interpretation is the distinction between sinlessness and impassibility. Christ's manhood was always sinless, but before the resurrection it was passible.

---

[1] Ibid., I, p. 31.

[2] Ibid.

> The body of Christ, our Redeemer was always uninjured by sin, and it was holy. [But it became] impassible and immortal [only] after the resurrection; the impassible Word hypostatically united to Him body, for which it is natural to suffer and to die.[1]

Therefore, the statement that Christ suffered voluntarily does not refer to His manhood; it refers only to God the Word who made the passions of the body His own. So

> we must confess that the Only-begotten God the Word, who was from before the ages and uncreated, took created flesh possessing rational soul from the seed of David and Abraham, of whom descended the Virgin Theotokos.[2]

And, in assuming manhood in this way, God let manhood play its role even in the redeeming act.

> For it [the body] was holy from its formation. It is not because He [God the Word] is incapable of making it all of a sudden immortal and impassible that He left it to be subject to suffering and death; but it is because He willed that he [man], for whom it is natural to suffer, should not triumph over death by a forcible exercise of power that befits God.[3]

Salvation of man is the work of God; but it was not achieved merely by a divine act. On the other hand, God accomplished it in union with man, and it was realised in a human life which itself needed healing.

---

[1] Ibid., I, p. 26.

[2] Ibid., I, p. 24.

[3] Ibid., I, p. 30.

> The first Adam , while he was mortal, knew Eve, his wife. And he became the father of us, mortal children, who are born of him. But the second Adam, being sick on account of the fact that He assumed passible flesh united healingly to Himself without blemish and sin, left it the flesh to remain passible and mortal, so that, by words of justice, not by power befitting God, He may dissolve the domination of death.[1]

In regard to the question whether there was any difference between Christ's body before the resurrection and after, Severus writes:

> The body of Christ, our God and Saviour, did not undergo any difference in *ousia*. For, in ousia, it was the same both before and after the resurrection. But after the resurrection it gained impassibility and immortality.[2]

The statement that Christ suffered and not suffered applies to one and to the other (ἄλλο καὶ ἄλλο). He suffers in the flesh humanly because He became man; but divinely He is impassible because He is God.[3]

On the strength of the passages reproduced above we can put the emphasis of Severus in this way. When God the Word became incarnate, He assumed the same manhood that is individuated in any other man. It was as much involved in the effects of the fall as that of our race, with the only exception of sin. The manhood of Christ itself needed redemption from corruption, and that was not given to it, except by the resurrection subsequent to a life of suffering and death. This life was assumed as His own by God the Word, and through the manhood, by means of the resurrection, incorruption was given to the human race.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, I, p. 30.

[2] *Ibid.*, I, p. 38.

[3] *Ibid.*, II, p. 4.

Severus says that this was the teaching of Athanasius, the Cappadocians, John Chrysostom, Cyril and Timothy Aclurus, and quotes from the writings of these men. Since Timothy Aelurus was a critic of Chalcedon, we may reproduce here two passages from his works quoted by Severus.

> Like as He was fatigued by journeying, not in phantasy, He slept like us, and felt the pain of torture when He was scourged by Pilate. When He was beaten in His face, He suffered pain, and when He was nailed in His hands and feet, He underwent the agony of pain.[1]

Again:

> We anathematise as heretics those who say that when He was beaten, it did not pain Him, or that when He was crucified, being struck by nails, He did not suffer.[2]

Therefore, we can definitely say that, in defending the Alexandrine phrases over against the Antiochene expression "two natures after the union" which Chalcedon sanctioned, Severus was not led by a monophysite Christology.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, I, p. 28.

[2] *Ibid.*

He maintained very emphatically that Christ's manhood was real and dynamic, and that it concurred with the divine nature into a glorious union. The manhood of Christ was not, for him, a passive recepient of divine operations.

Having maintained and taught a Christology of this kind, Severus can claim that the emphasis on real humanity was not an exclusive contribution of the Antiochene theology, and that for making it there is no need to run the risk of viewing the one Christ as two centres of being and operation. He can also say that if, in asserting the phrase "two natures after the union," Chalcedon was concerned only to affirm fulness of humanity in Christ, that Council did not achieve anything which, without accepting the disputed phrase, his section of the Church had not upheld.

Viewed theologically, the concern of Chalcedon was to safeguard fulness of humanity in Christ. The Council's critics, including Dioscorus, had never objected to this affirmation. For at Chalcedon Dioscorus had made it clear that for him there was no "confusion," "mixture," "change" or "division" in the union. This means that, even after the union, the human nature was human nature, and that it had its place in the union. Severus drew the implications of this statement of Dioscorus probably more clearly than any non-Chalcedonian theologian before him had done. This, however, does not reduce him to the status of a lonely man. On the other hand, he was interpreting the Christology of an ecclesiastical tradition, the roots of which lay in the Alexandrine way of thinking. In fact, we can say that, in his exposition, Severus was influenced by Antiochene as well as Chalcedonian criticism of his own section of the Church. If this reading is permissible, the Christology of Severus is a synthesis. This, however, is not a terminological synthesis, but is ideological.

Chapter Four

The Positive Christological Teaching of Severus

In the last two chapters we have noted the theological emphasis of Severus, on the strength of which he opposed both Chalcedon and the docetic trends prevalent in his day. In this chapter we shall try to bring out the way in which he worked out a rather comprehensive doctrine of the Incarnation.

For Severus, Jesus Christ is One incarnate Nature of God the Word. Who, then, is God the Word? The answer to this question is found in his explanation of the doctrine of the Trinity. Severus affirms that God is one _Ousia_ and three _Hypostases_. This language goes back to the Cappadocian fathers. We have already made a brief reference to it in our treatment of the Severian treatment of the terms _ousia_ and _hypostasis_,[1] and that may be recalled in this context.

Formerly these two terms had been taken as virtually synonymous. But these men made a distinction in meaning between them. Accordingly, _ousia_ came to be regarded as signifying the reality common to the members of a class; and hypostasis as referring to the members themselves. This statement is misleading, if it is taken as an adequate representation of the Cappadocian treatment of terms as applied to the Trinity. We have already noted that these men were Origenists in theology, and that they identified ousia with the eidos of Plato, taking it in the sense of the archetype. In this way, they maintained that ousia, as applied to God, is Godhead. The Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, each one of them has It in Its perfection. This, however, does not mean that, as ousia, Godhead exists apart from the three Hypostases--a fact which is real in the case of any other ousia and hypostases. Manhood, for instance, is found in its concreteness in every man; but it has a reality in itself which is not exhausted even by taking all the members of the human race together. So the Cappadocians insisted that Godhead in Its entirety is in the Father; from Him the Son, as the second principle in God, derives His being by generation; and the Holy Spirit, as the third principle, obtains His being from the Father by procession. In this way, they maintained, the Son and the Holy Spirit are co-eternal and co-equal with the Father, and Godhead is the same for all the three.

---

[1] See above p. 282.

However, from the point of view of hypostasis, each one of them is distinct from the other two. This distinction lies in the specific characteristics of each. Thus the Father has, in addition to being perfect God, fatherhood, whereby it is meant that He does not derive His being from any one else. The Son is perfect God born of the Godhead in the Father. As Father and Son, the two are distinct from each other. The Holy Spirit is also perfect God, proceeding from the Godhead in the Father; He is distinct from both the Father and the Son. The unity of God lies in the _ousia_, on account of which each one indwells the other two completely and eternally. In this way, the three have one will and one operation.

Severus claims to stand in this tradition. He does not seem to have received any influence from the interpretation of the Trinitarian doctrine worked out by Augustine. In fact, his treatment of the subject is not intended by him to be comprehensive. In his _Contra Grammaticum_, in which he takes it up, he is answering a criticism of the Grammarian that the non-Chalcedonian objection to the phrase "in two natures" was based on a wrong view of Godhead. Severus quotes the criticism of the Grammarian in these words.

> _The Grammarian_: If you say that Christ has two natures, the necessary conclusion is that the Father and the Spirit also--to be brief, the Holy Trinity--became incarnate in the entirety of humanity. This is the objection from opponents; for they think that the _Ousia_ of Godhead is divisible in

> such a way that part of It is in the Father, part in the Son, and part in the Holy Spirit.[1]

As we shall see in the next Chapter, the Grammarian took the term "nature" in the phrase "in two natures" in the sense of ousia, and the non-Chalcedonians criticised this definition of the term on the ground that practically it would mean an incarnation of the holy Trinity in the aggregate of all human beings.[2] In this passage the Grammarian is saying that the non-Chalcedonian objection to his definition of the term was based on a defective understanding of the Trinitarian doctrine. He, then, goes on to explain his view of the doctrine in these words.

> On the contrary, we say that every hypostasis, that has become concrete, has all the qualities of Godhead without diminution, such as goodness, creativity and everything that belongs to the uncreated nature. In this way we affirm that the Trinity is of the same ousia. The selfsame ousia is perfectly perceived in the three prosopa. The Father has the divine ousia in its entirety; in the same way, the Son and the Holy Spirit have it. Therefore, the Father is perfect God, the Son is perfect God, and the Holy Spirit is perfect God.[3]

Severus, in fact, has no objection to the position outlined by the Grammarian. He writes:

> We affirm that one is the ousia of the three Hypostases, namely the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, that is one Godhead; for the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Spirit is God.[4]

---

[1] Contr. Gr., I, p. 153. [2] See below pp. 425f.

[3] Contr. Gr., I, p. 153. [4] Ibid., p. 156.

He, then, goes on to provide an analogy.

> One may say, for instance, that one is the humanity of Peter, Paul and John. For men are the same in race and ousia, but separate from the point of view of individual designation of hypostasis. Every one of the hypostases that belong to the race and ousia, who are comprehended within the common signification, namely ousia, which includes many hypostases, participates alike in those that belong in common to the race. Peter, for example, participates in that which is common to the race and ousia.[1]

That which is common to the race is, according to Severus, "rationality, mortality and the possession of mind and knowledge." Every man participates in it. Such participation does not lead us to regard the ousia of man as being divided into many parts and each being attached to every man. The common is, therefore, real. By reason of separate concretions, the ousia itself is individuated into hypostases; and "because each one of the hypostases came into being separately and specifically, . . . the ousia cannot be said to have been divided."

Applying the principle behind this illustration, Severus writes in regard to the doctrine of the Trinity.

> Each one of the Hypostases, therefore, has the common individuated distinctly and separately. The Father, for instance, is unbegotten, is distinct from the others, and possesses a concrete Hypostasis. He has the ousia, the common, individuated in Him along with being unbegotten. He is God, the Good, the Light, the Life. In the same way, the Son has "being begotten of the Father" as the property of His Hypostasis.

---

[1] *Ibid.*

> He has the common and the ousia individuated in Him. He is God the begotten, the Good, the Light, the Life. So also is the Holy Spirit. He has procession as the property of His Hypostasis. He also has the ousia and the unity with the common individuated in Him. He is the Light that proceeds, the Life, God.[1]

In the case of man, ousia is real in itself; but in the case of God, the ousia has no reality in itself apart from the three Hypostases. "It is, therefore, clear," writes Severus, "that the holy Trinity has nothing prior to it."[2]

Severus has definitely answered the Grammarian's accusation that his theory divides the divine ousia into three parts and assigns each to one of the three Hypostases. Before we bring this discussion to a close, we have to examine whether Severus regards this interpretation of the Trinitarian doctrine as satisfactory. "The holy Trinity," he writes, "is not subject to natural definitions, nor is prone to be investigated by our reason; because what It is is unknowable. Beyond everything and transcending all thought, It is incomprehensible to the operation of our minds."[3] Again he writes: "The holy Trinity is, therefore, the first and transcends everything exceedingly. Above ousia, and beyond nature, It does not fall under these terms."[4] These terms have only a symbolic value.

---

[1] Contr. Gr., I, p. 157. [2] _Ibid._, p. 156.

[3] _Ibid._, p. 154. [4] _Ibid._, p. 155.

The primary relation of the Son to the Father in the Godhead is unity in ousia. So He is perfect God, co-eternal and co-equal with the Father and the Holy Spirit. Born of the Father, He is the Unique Son. This generation is in eternity, without beginning and beyond time. Therefore, the Son is the "Wisdom and the Power of God." Like the Word, He was "born of the Father without a beginning and without being subject either to passion or to bodily limitations." Begotten of the Father "beyond time, before the ages and in eternity," the Son is the "Brilliance of His glory and the Image of His Person," and He is "of the same ousia with Him who begat Him." He is "the Only-begotten and the Unique from the Unique, possessing in His being, without diminution, everything that the Father has." Thus born, "He abides" in His Father as His "unchangeable Portrait."[1]

It is the Son who became incarnate. The crucial passage from the Bible to which Severus again and again refers is the Johannine statement that the Word became flesh and dwelt among us. He takes the term "Word" to mean the eternal Son of the eternal Father, Himself perfect God. The Incarnation was the dispensation of the Son of God, which He voluntarily assumed for the salvation of man.

---

[1] Homilies of Severus: Patr. Or., VIII, p. 216.

In the *Philalethes* Severus prefixes to his refutation of the Chalcedonian collection of Cyrilline passages[1] a statement, dealing with the difference between the phrases "one incarnate nature of God the Word" and "two natures after the union."

> God the Word who, as the Only-begotten, was born of the Father without beginning and eternal, without passion and body, for our salvation, became, in the last days, flesh of the Holy Spirit and of the holy *Theotokos* and ever Virgin Mary. The flesh which is of the same substance with us, animated with a rational and intelligent soul, had not come into being before the indwelling of the Word in the womb of the Virgin. If it were otherwise, it would be false to say that the Word became flesh. On the other hand, if it is true that the Word became flesh, obviously He was not remote from conception; but at the first moment, and at a time which cannot be separated, when Gabriel announced to the Virgin and said, "Hail, full of joy! the Lord is with thee," we believe that the Power of the Most High, namely the Hypostasis of God the Word indwelt inexplicably and inconceivably in the Virgin in a way He alone knows. Since, therefore, He united to Him a body for which it is natural to be conceived and born, He is said to have been conceived and born. . . . He is in the likeness of the Father, namely of the substance of God. While remaining unchangeably in those i.e. in that mode of being in which He was, He assumed a body taken from a woman; this is Hypostatic union. Born in this way, He showed that the Virgin was *Theotokos*. Thus He was called Emmanuel, /composed/ as He was of two natures, which remain in perfection each according to its principle, the same being at once God and

---

[1] See above, pp. 305f.

> man. That He is Emmanuel, namely God with us, means that God the Word united to Him our entire ousia, not neglecting anything of which our manhood is formed. He identified Himself in everything except sin with His brethren, in order that He may render perfect salvation to those who remained fallen under sin. Since the Word dwelt in the Virgin and united to Him our nature, namely flesh animated with a rational soul, and made it His own in the dispensation, there was no time in which the flesh was divided from the Word; for it the flesh had not come into being apart from union with God the Word. How, then, can that which came into being without division, that created flesh which, when it came into being was united with the Word that is before the ages and uncreated, be separated, and how can we affirm two natures of Christ who is one? Thought, however, distinguishes in contemplation the difference of the natures--namely Godhead and manhood--which came together into the union. But when there enters along with it the thought of union, it is not permissible to say two of Him who is of two and who is composed into an indivisible union. It is, therefore, clear that we must affirm one incarnate nature of God the Word as indispensable to safeguard the mystery of the divine incarnation.[1]

We have already noted the ideas contained in this passage forcibly stated by Severus in the course of the last two chapters. In the present context we shall bring out some of the implications of an affirmation like this which Severus himself has made clear.

In the first place, by the Incarnation "the divine nature of the Word was not changed into what it was not"; for He remains eternally what He is. "The Word became flesh for us, without changing what He was, but assuming in addition what He was not; for He became truly man. Therefore, the selfsame is both perfect God and perfect man." The Word "was invisible, not subject to sensory perception; but He became visible, and what He became came to be seen. That which He was, and that which He became, are not two, because He is one."[1] In his work against the Grammarian he expresses the same idea. "He who was, from eternity and before the ages, incorporeal mercifully took upon Himself at the end of days to be bound up in flesh which had a rational soul."[2]

---

[1] Philalethes, op. cit., pp. 131-133.

The Son of God became man, but He did not change His being into the being of a man.

Secondly, Incarnation was a dispensatory act of God. As God, He fills everything, and His operation is discernible everywhere in nature and also in man. Such operation of God is not personal revelation. It is a revelation of God's controlling and guiding act. In the Incarnation, on the other hand, there was a personal revelation of God. So in his letter to Emesenes Severus writes:

> Even though the Word of God is infinite, the whole of Him was united to the flesh

---

[1] Homilies of Severus, Patr. Or., VIII, p. 236.

[2] Contr. Gr., I, p. 77.

> received from the holy Virgin Theotokos and ever Virgin Mary, even the very Hypostasis of the Word, and not a partial operation as in the prophets.[1]

The mystery lying behind the Son's dispensation is beautifully expressed in the same letter.

> And the subtlety of the mystery cannot be explained by reason and intellect, how the whole of Him was in the flesh, and the whole of Him in all things, and the whole of Him superior to all things, and He Himself is Ruler of all in infinity.

We have already noted that for Severus there is a difference between the Word before the Incarnation and the Word after it. Before the Incarnation the Son was "simple" and unincarnate. After it He became "composite" and incarnate. At the same time, the Person of the Son is the same.[2]

Thirdly, God accepted the dispensation for the salvation of the human race. Created in the image of God, by his rebellion against his Creator, man became a fallen creature. Having been reduced to this state, he had no hope of attaining to the goal for which he had been originally made. Now the Son of God, who created him in the beginning and in whom is his being and destiny, took pity on his miserable plight, and assumed a life akin to his own, with a view to save him for ever.

---

[1] Patr. Or., XII, p. 239.

[2] See above pp. 337f.

> Subsequent to the Fall from the blessed life in the Paradise of Eden, when the verdict on sin had been pronounced, and it was said to Adam, "Earth art thou, and unto the earth shalt thou return"; when our race, as a chariot rushing down a precipice, had been hastening to utter destruction, unable as it was to turn and look toward heaven; and when there was no way or knowledge either to raise or draw upwards them who had been ruined and fallen; then the Word on high brought Himself down.[1]

Fourthly, when it is affirmed that God the Son became man, it does not mean that either the universe was deprived of His control and care during His incarnate life, or His providence was administered from the incarnate state. There is a mystery here which human reason cannot unravel. So Severus writes in his Hymn on the Nativity.

> He who is the maker of the entire creation and the controller of everything, like a good shepherd, left the body-less sacred hosts in thousands and the angelic orders in tens of thousands--He left them in a way He alone knows--and descended mysteriously without ever being separated from them. He by whom everything is filled came after the lost sheep of the human race to find it. Voluntarily He entered the fold and was numbered among the sheep by becoming man and without undergoing a change.[2]

On the one hand, He left the angelic hosts; but on the other, He was still with them. From the point of view of the fact that He left them, He was numbered among men. On the strength of this emphasis, we may say that the

---

[1] Hymns of Severus, Patr. Or., VI, pp. 55-56.

[2] Ibid., p. 54.

Son of God, in the fulness of His Hypostasis, was in that human life; but this did not exhaust the fulness of His operations. In other words, the Godhead of the Son was fully in that human life. However, it was not limited in its operations to that earthly life. The earthly life was, so to say, exclusively for the redemption of the human race. It was absolutely unique and unrepeatable. The Son's operations are innumerable. They continued without any break. The economy which the Son took upon Himself did not affect them, nor did it introduce any discontinuity in His status with the Triune Godhead. In this emphasis Severus stands in the tradition of Athanasius, who, in his work on The Incarnation of the Word, had maintained a similar view.[1] Severus quotes from Cyril to show that he also had held this position.

> For, while He is one and only Son, and completely above all human phantasy, the whole of Him is, in virtue of a gift, in every man, and in each one by presence, not being divided or cleft asunder, but [above] everything by nature, and in everything as God. But in that all-pure and holy body "all the fulness of Godhead bodily has come to dwell," as it is written.[2]

Fifthly, why is this affirmation made? Severus admits that this is something which human mind is incapable of arguing out logically, but that we accept it on faith.

---

[1] The Incarnation of the Word, section 17.

[2] Patr. Or., XII, p. 243.

> But that we believe the very Hypostasis of God the Word to have become incarnate, according to the apostolic tradition of the Church, which has been handed down from of old, it is superfluous for us to demonstrate by testimonies to those who have once believed in the Gospel.[1]

In one of his Homilies Severus takes up the subject in more detail.[2] There also he maintains that the Incarnation is a mystery which human reason cannot explain logically. The ways of God are beyond man's capacity to comprehend. A human child, for instance, is formed of body and soul. How they are completed into a unity, is beyond us to understand. The Incarnation is a much greater mystery. Why, then, is it affirmed? Severus answers that this is what the divinely inspired Scriptures teach us. When the Gospel affirms that "the Word became flesh and dwelt among us," it means for Severus thar the Son of God became incarnate. How do we know that this is what the Gospel implies? Severus answers that the Christian tradition has understood it only in this way. In other words, for Severus, the ground of the doctrine lies in the Scriptures, understood in the light of Christian tradition.

All this springs from a soteriological concern. "He became incarnate, in order to vouchsage liberation to us, slaves of sin."[1] Christology, therefore, is built on soteriology. Its foundation lies in the Biblical witness proclaimed in and by the living Church.

---

[1] _Ibid._, p. 240. [2] _Ibid._, VIII,

We shall now pass on to examine how Severus explained the reality of Christ's manhood. In regard to His birth, we have already noted the emphasis of Severus. As in the case of any other man, in Christ there was an individuation of the human ousia. This individuation happened in union with the Word. Having thus become concrete as a man, He underwent growth and development.

> We affirm that it is in union with God the Word that the flesh animated with soul and mind which was conceived in the all pure womb of the Virgin Theotokos came into being and received its beginning of existence. In this way, the flesh had its being in concurrence with the Word who is before the ages. Thus He is known to have been conceived. Having completed the period of time in the state of conception, He was born in the flesh. The words "became flesh" mean that the flesh came into being in the very incarnate nature of God the Word, and that it namely the flesh gradually underwent development as well as taking on the likeness of man. By no means did it come into being apart from the union with God the Word.[2]

The emphasis is clear. At the first moment of the conception there occurred a union of God the Word with the flesh that was being formed. In this way, the Word who is eternally unincarnate became incarnate, and the flesh came to belong to the incarnate Word. From that first moment on, the flesh had its normal growth and development like any other man. The same idea is stated again.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 227.

[2] Contr. Gr., I, p. 183.

> From the beginning of the concretion and formation in the womb, the Word who is before the ages united to Him flesh animated with soul and mind without any interval of time on the occasion of its coming into being and existence. The moment of time in which the flesh passed into a state of being and in which the union with the Word [happened] was the same.[1] So He, who like God is more perfect than anything else in His nature, is recognised to have become a child in the flesh without change.[2]

The reality of Christ's manhood was upheld by Severus in two ways. On the one hand, there was in Him an individuation of manhood as in any other man; and on the other, this manhood had its role in the union. Thus the manhood was conceived by the Virgin, and during the period of over nine months in the womb it grew into a perfect human child ready to be born. When the time came, He was born like any other human child.

In regard to the birth of Christ, Severus maintains two ideas. One: The birth was from a Virgin without any male cooperation. The affirmation of the Virgin birth was not tantamount to a denial of full manhood. The fulness of manhood lay in the concurrence into one being of body--ousia and soul-ousia. This has happened in Christ, and therefore born of a Virgin mother, He was perfect man.

---

[1] Lebon's edition of Contra Grammaticum reads ܘܙܒܢܐ
ܡܢ [illegible] ܗܘܐ ܘܚܕܝܘܬܗ [illegible] ܗܘ ܗܘ ܗܘܐ: [illegible]
ܘܚܕ ܗܘܐ ܙܒܢܐ:
This sentence is taken here as ܘܙܒܢܐ ܡܢ [illegible] ܗܘܐ
ܘܚܕܝܘܬܗ - - - -

[2] Contr. Gr., I, p. 184.

The affirmation of Severus is of a real birth. So, in opposition to a certain Mara who had taught that "the holy Virgin did not feel the birth" of the child, Severus writes to bishop Antoninus of Aleppo:

> The most eloquent among prophets, Isaiah, shows that He came forth from the bond of virginity, being ineffably born of Mary the Theotokos without rending it [the virginity]. For he says,[1] "Before she that travailed bare, and before the pain of labour came, she was delivered and gave birth to a male child." The words "she was delivered," show that she gave birth feeling [the reality of the birth], and that the birth was not in phantasy.

After referring to a statement of Gregory Nazianzen on this subject, Severus goes on.

> He who willed to come truly in everything that belongs to us and identify Himself with us His brethren in all things except sin, was most certainly born in the flesh by a manifest and real birth, causing her who bare to feel [the reality of the birth], though she was free from all pain and suffering.[2]

Therefore, according to Severus, the birth was real, the Virgin mother had the feeling that she was giving birth to a child, but she was spared the pain and suffering due to it.

---

[1] Isaiah 66:7.

[2] Patr. Or., XII, pp. 260-261.

Two: The Virgin mother did not give birth to a mere human child. The union of the natures had happened at the first moment of the conception, and therefore the child was God the Word united with manhood. We have already noted this emphasis in Severus. In the Philalethes he quotes a passage from Cyril taken from the latter's letter to monks. Since it expresses the idea very clearly, we may reproduce it here.

> The mystery regarding Him is like our birth. Mothers on earth, while serving the natural process of birth, have in their womb flesh which is being gradually shaped. By the ineffable operation of God it grows and becomes perfect for human perception. God puts spirit in life in a way He knows; for He forms man's spirit in him, as the prophet says. The principle of the flesh is different from that of the soul. But though mothers are mothers of bodies alone on earth, they give birth to the whole being composed of body and soul, and they are not said to be giving birth to a part. Neither does any one say that Elizabeth bears flesh but not soul. . . . The same thing happened in regard to the birth of Emmanuel. The Unique Word, as I said, was of the ousia of the Father. But He was called the Son of Man when He assumed flesh which He made His own, and He became like us. It is not improper to say, in fact it ought rather to be confessed, that He was born in the flesh through a woman; even as the soul of man is born with its body and is counted one with it, though by nature the former is known to be different from the latter from the point of view of their respective principles.[1]

---

[1] Philalethes, pp. 136-137.

This emphasis is the ground for regarding the Virgin as Theotokos. It does not in any way minimise the fulness of Christ's manhood. In fact, as we shall try to show later, the Alexandrine phrases were all intended to give expression to soteriologically determined theological affirmations.

As for the manhood of Christ, Severus makes two affirmations. On the one hand, the manhood with the possibility of growth and development was made His own by God the Word; and on the other, there was an exchange of properties between God the Word and the manhood. We have already noted these ideas in another context. We shall refer here to a passage in which the second idea is clearly stated by Severus.

> But if Emmanuel is one, composed of Godhead and manhood which, in their respective principles, remain perfect, and it the hypostatic union without confusion excludes division and preserves the difference of those that came together into one in the dispensatory union, those properties that belong by nature to manhood have come to belong to the very Godhead of the Word, and those that belong to the Word to the very manhood which he united hypostatically to Himself.[1]

We may enumerate the emphases of Severus.

1. Christ's manhood was the result of an individuation of the human ousia.

---

[1] Patr. Or., XII, pp. 178-179.

2. The individuation took place in union with God the Word.

3. On account of the individuation of the human ousia, as man, Christ was of the same substance with us.

4. This manhood was real and dynamic in the union at every moment of Christ's life.

5. But by reason of the union, the manhood and the role it played were assumed as His own by God the Word.

6. In assuming the manhood as His own, God the Word exchanged with it divine qualities.

On the strength of these emphases, Severus can view the manhood of Christ as real and perfect in many ways. In the first place, the manhood was not changed to Godhead. On this point he is very emphatic. "For the flesh does not renounce its being flesh, though it became the flesh of God; nor did the Word depart from His nature."[1] Secondly, the union did not affect the creaturely status or freedom of the manhood.

> Those therefore who confess one incarnate nature of God the Word and do not confuse those of which He is composed, recognise also the property of those that came together into the union.[2]

Thirdly, in the union God the Word permitted the manhood to exercise its role. In this way, the babe in the womb grew into the fulness of a child and when the time came He was born into the world. Having been thus born, "the child grew and became strong, filled with wisdom; and the favour of God was upon Him."[1] Fourthly, the manhood of Christ had everything that our manhood has, but sin. Therefore, He could be ignorant of the last day; be subject to the limitations of a finite existence; hunger, thirst and be physically fatigued; be rejected by His own people and be handed over to political leaders as a criminal; and suffer pain and death. Every one of these was real, not phantasmal or illusory. Fifthly, all these were taken over by God the Word as His own in the dispensation, so that by assuming them He may vouchsafe to man ultimate salvation.

---

[1] The Letter to Oecumenius, Patr. Or., XIII, p. 176.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 177.

It is clear from this discussion that for Severus there was in Christ a union of Godhead and manhood. By reason of this ineffable union, God acted personally to redeem the fallen human race. This emphasis has to answer the question regarding the status of the risen Christ. Severus takes up this point in dealing with the case of a man in the church of Homs. According to his teaching, as Severus states in his letter despatched to that church, "after His own resurrection we must confess that God the

---

[1] Luke 2:52.

Word is without flesh, inasmuch as He put off that which was united to Him hypostatically without change and separation."

Severus starts his refutation of this view which, in his judgment, is "beyond all impiety and profanity," by referring to a passage in the letter of Gregory Nazianzen addressed to Cledonius, which reads,

> If any one says that the flesh has now been laid down and the Godhead is devoid of body, and does not confess that He is and will come with the thing assumed, he shall not see the glory of His coming. For where is now the body, but with Him who assumed it. It is not laid up in the sun, as the silly tale of the Manichees goes, so that, lowly as it is it may be raised there to a status of honour; nor is it diffused and dissolved in the air like the nature of voice, the dissemination of smell or the course of lightning that does not stop. What, then, about the fact that He was touched after the resurrection, or that He will be seen by those who pierced Him? For Godhead by itself is invisible. He will come, as I said, with His body, in the same way as He was seen by, or appeared to, the disciples, though Godhead indeed is devoid of the flesh.[1]

Severus proceeds to comment that in His nature, namely Godhead, He is without flesh and blood. But in the dispensation He assumed flesh and blood. This, however, was not because Godhead was lacking in perfection; on the other hand, it was for the salvation of the human race. His assumption of flesh did not take the nature of the flesh into the ousia of Godhead.

---

[1] Patr. Or., XII, pp. 226-227.

> Therefore, the flesh remained flesh even after the God-befitting resurrection and ascension. It shines in all the glory that becomes God. As the body of God, it is divine, and has not been changed into the ousia of Godhead.[1]

We have already noted that for Severus, the eternal Son of God who created man in the beginning assumed a human life in order to redeem the whole race. This was a personal act of God the Son, unique and unrepeatable. As a divine dispensation, it did not cease with the historic life of Jesus Christ. He came into the world as the Mediator between God and man, and as the Second Adam, He continues to be the Head of the human race which had been recreated in Him.

In his work against the Grammarian, Severus treats very briefly the purpose of the Incarnation. As it will help us to understand his thought better, we shall reproduce it here.

> The Only-begotten Son of God became of the same substance with us and was united hypostatically to one flesh animated with a rational soul. By reason of this, the entire human ousia and the whole race became united in love (εὐδοκία) to the divine nature, to which formerly it had been opposed. On account of this, as it is written, we became partakers of the divine nature, having been made worthy of the original harmony. As by participation, we obtained divine gifts and immortality which had been lost to us by means of the trespass of Adam.[2]

---

[1] Patr. Or., XII, p. 238. [2] Contr. Gr., I, p. 200.

Severus, then, quotes a passage from the third book of Cyril against Nestorius.

> Being God in His nature He became man truly, in order that we may be called a race, not in the tradition of the first earthly (Adam), to whom God had said, "Earth art thou, and unto earth shalt thou return," mortal as he was, but in that of the second (Adam).[1]

Again in his fifth book Cyril wrote:

> By Him we are found partakers of the divine nature, and we who were afar off have become neighbours. Being united in love (εὐδοκία) with the Father by Him and also with one another, we have received one Faith and unity, because we have participated in the one Spirit.[2]

The idea which Severus tries to conserve seems to be something like this. Man was created by God in order that he might maintain an unbroken relation with his Creator--a relation of love (εὐδοκία). But by reason of the fall, it became impossible for him to remain in that relation any longer. Fallen as he was, man could not regain his lost status with God. In that pitiable situation, God Himself took compassion on man, and, by raising a member of the human race in a hypostatic union with Himself, God the Son accomplished salvation for the entire race. By reason of this union, the human nature thus assumed by God was made the Mediator between God and man. In Him God assumed as His own everything human, with the exception of sin which did not form part of God's creation, and accomplished redemption for man once for all. The Mediator, however, has not been taken up into the Triune Godhead, nor has the Godhead of the Word been exhausted by the divine economy made manifest in the Mediator.

---

[1] Contr. Gr., I, p. 201. [2] Ibid.

One emphasis in this theological reflection needs special mention. As we have seen, the Antiochenes maintained the theory of a prosopic union. For Severus, the prosopic union comprehended only the relation between God and every man originally intended by man's Creator. And this is precisely the relation which, because of the fall, man could not either maintain or regain. It is to help every man regain it that God assumed a hypostatic union with one concretion of the human ousia. In other words, what God has done in Jesus Christ is more than what Adam would have attained had he not fallen, and the theory of a prosopic union cannot express this idea.

Before we close this chapter, we have to examine whether this Christological teaching can be characterised as Monophysite at all. The basis of this designation is the phrase μία φύσις τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου σεσαρκωμένη (one incarnate nature of God the Word) which Severus defended in opposition to Chalcedon. However, the question whether from this phrase the appellation "Monophysite" can be derived, or whether in their theological statements either Severus or the men recognised by his section of the Church have fallen into that erronious way of thinking, does not seem to have been adequately treated.

As we have seen, the phrase "One incarnate nature of God the Word" came to be ascribed to Athanasius, and no one in the ancient Church doubted that he had used it. That this ascription was the work of Apollinarius or his disciples, is a piece of information which we gather from modern textual studies. In ancient times, the phrase and the assumption that Athanasius was its author were crucial for the entire Christological thinking of Cyril of Alexandria. Severus very definitely says that the phrase "two natures after the union" and the idea which the Antiochenes tried to assert on its basis, were alien to the theology of Cyril. That Severus is right on this point is easy to show. For, as we have seen, in their desperate attempt to establish a connection between Cyril and Chalcedon, sixth century Chalcedonians could not adduce a single passage from any of the prolific writings of the Alexandrine to prove their thesis. On the contrary, of their collected excerpts, a number of them were taken out of a context in which Cyril had definitely excluded "two natures after the union" and strongly advocated "one incarnate nature of God the Word." In fact, Chalcedonians themselves endeavoured to claim Cyril for the Council only by arguing that the principle of a difference of the natures of which is the one Christ--an emphasis central to his Christology--would yield "two natures after the union." This method itself was faulty, and Severus challenged it, by making it clear that his section of the Church accepted that principle in the same way as Cyril had done. We have noted that neither Dioscorus nor any of his followers had ever been accused, on the strength of any evidence, of having abandoned this principle or having misquoted Cyril, but that Severus charged sixth century Chalcedonians of the latter crime.

On the strength of these facts, it is legitimate to say that, if the use of the phrase "one incarnate nature of God the Word" is enough to convict a man of monophysitism, the first incorrigible heretic of that description was Cyril of Alexandria. In fact, as long as he was alive, for Theodoret and the Antiochenes, he was an unrepentant teacher of "confusion." According to Ibas, Cyril's orthodoxy lay in his acceptance of the Antiochene interpretation, in his rejection of the phrase "one nature," and in his expression of regret for having employed it. But the fact is that, till the last moment of his life on earth, he had not done any one of these three things. There are several places in his Contra

Grammaticum where Severus laughs at the Grammarian's charge that his section of the Church maintained "Eutychianism" or a theology of "confusion," by referring to the way in which Nestorius, Theodoret, Andrew of Samosata and other Antiochenes had not ceased from misrepresenting Cyril. However, in the very presence of Theodoret and Ibas, Cyril was the one man to whom the most glorious tribute possible was paid at Chalcedon. Therefore, according to Chalcedon, Cyril was not a monophysite.

As we shall see in the next chapter, both the Grammarian and Leontius of Byzantium were willing to grant that there was value in the phrase "one incarnate nature of God the Word"; but for both of them, unless the phrase "in two natures" or "two natures after the union" was added to it, by itself, this phrase would yielf only a "Eutychian" or an Apollinarian Christology. However, neither of them showed any understanding of the fact that, by clinging to "one incarnate nature of God the Word" and by rejecting "two natures after the union," both Cyril and the non-Chalcedonians had excluded every heresy till then known. On the contrary, these Chalcedonian theologians assumed that Cyril had sanctioned the very phrase which he had excluded till his death, and that the theology of his real successors could not but be "Eutychian" or Apollinarian.

This survey of facts is enough to show the confusion which lay behind the charge of "Eutychianism" made against the non-Chalcedonian section of the Church in ancient times. Subsequent Chalcedonian history, however, went beyond this confusion. One of the works of Leontius, for insatnce, was entitled πρὸς τοῦς μίαν φύσιν λέγοντας σύνθετον τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χρίστον (Against those who affirm of our Lord Jesus Christ one composite nature. . . .) But the Latin translator, having given an exact rendering of this title at the beginning, refers to it on subsequent pages of the work as *Contra Monophysitas*.[1] That μίαν φύσιν σύνθετον λόγοντας cannot be translated as *Monophysitas* is obvious.

We shall now pass on to examine briefly whether even the phrase μία φύσις σεσαρκωμένη can be rendered as Monophysite. This has to be done on the strength of the meaning of μία and μόνος, as well as on the basis of the way in which non-Chalcedonian theologians interpreted the phrase.

I. THE MEANING OF THE WORDS Μία AND Μόνος

That μία is the feminine form of εἷς ἕν, and that it is intrinsically related to ἑνώσις --

---

[1] PG., LXXXVI, pp. 1069 f.

union-- are facts which do not need any detailed discussion. For the Alexandrine theologians, the incarnate nature of God the Word is μία, not μόνος.

What, then, is the difference between these two words? According to Liddell and Scott, μόνος means *alone*, *solitary*, *single*, *unique*. εἷς, μία, ἕν, on the other hand, is the word for the numeral *one*. It signifies *one* in the general sense, and it connotes the idea of possessing unity, in addition to the numeral character of the *one*.

In *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, Arndt and Gingrich give the same meanings. According to them, μόνος means *only*, *alone*, *deserted*, *isolated*, (*one*) *by itself*. But εἷς, μία, ἕν is the word for the numeral *one*. In this sense, the latter word can mean *one* as in "one of the twelve"-- ὁ εἷς τῶν δώδεκα -- (Mark 14:10); or *one* in "We, though many, form one body"-- οἱ πολλοὶ ἕν σῶμα ἐσμεν -- (Romans 12:5); or *one* in "you are all one"-- πάντες εἷς ἐστε -- (Galatians 3:12); or the idea of *union* in "Who has united the two divisions"-- ὁ ποιήσας τὰ ἀμφότερα ἕν --(Ephesians 2:14).

On the strength of these dictionary meanings of the two words, it is legitimate to say that in Greek there is a difference between μόνος and εἷς, μία, ἕν. Whereas the former emphasises the unique and solitary character of the one, the latter, in addition to being the ordinary numeral one, connotes the idea of union within the one. In Syriac also this idea can be noted. The numeral in that language is ܚܕ; it can mean united one. On the other hand, ܝܚܝܕܝܐ or ܒܠܚܘܕܝܐ which corresponds to μόνος in Greek means unique or solitary. None of the Syrian theologians have ever referred to the nature of Christ as ܝܚܝܕܝܐ or ܒܠܚܘܕܝܐ but they always use ܚܕ. Therefore, it is by a leap not permissible by any code that should guide the formation of compound words in any language that "Monophysite" has been coined from the phrase μία φύσις. Behind it we can discern a deliberate refusal to be fair to the position characterised by the epithet.

II. THE NON-CHALCEDONIAN INTERPRETATION OF THE PHRASE "ONE INCARNATE NATURE OF GOD THE WORD"

If we define the word "Monophysite" in the light of the meaning of μόνος which we have seen, it will be single-natured or having only one nature. However, in the Christology of Severus, we have already seen that the emphasis is not on the singleness of Christ's nature, but on the indivisible union of the two natures. He made it clear, for instance, that in Christ, both in and after the union, there was a concurrence of the two natures, but that, because the natures expressed themselves only in and from the union, he could not accept the phrase "in two natures" or "two natures after the union," which in his view yielded only the idea that the union was of two concrete entities lying in the realm of *prosopon*.

Including Dioscorus, the non-Chalcedonian leaders have made it clear that for them (1) there was a union of two natures; (2) the human nature was from Mary the Virgin; (3) it was of the same substance with us; (4) in the union there was no confusion, nor did either nature change over into the other; and (5) since, however, the natures came together into the union, the phrase "two natures after the union" is not permissible, because it will negate the union by regarding the natures as concrete beings expressing themselves in a harmony of will and operation.

These admissions are enough to make us conclude that these men were not concerned to emphasise a *single nature* in Christ, nor were they maintaining that the human nature had only a passive role in the life of our Lord; but that their stress was on *the union of the two natures* in their reality and perfection. In fact, following Cyril, Severus goes on to insist that the theological position of his section of the Church is not "one nature" (μία φύσις), but "one incarnate nature of God the Word" (μία φύσις τοῦ θεοῦ Λόγου σεσαρκωμένη, the emphasis being on incarnate.

An ecclesiastical tradition which maintained this view of Christ can, therefore, on no account be characterised as Monophysite. There have been Monophysites in history; but the non-Chalcedonian branch of the Church has always excluded it.

Chapter Five

Severus and the Sixth Century Defenders of Chalcedon

The way in which Chalcedonian scholars undertook to defend the Council in the face of the Christological teaching developed by Severus needs some treatment here. The Church was divided, and neither party really wanted to understand the precise point of view of the other. As we shall see in this chapter, this statement is truer of the Chalcedonian party than of the other. By referring to the works of the Grammarian against whom Severus wrote his most important treatise and to those of Leontius of Byzantium, this fact can clearly be shown.

Of these two men, the Grammarian's work was answered by Severus in his _Contra Grammaticum_, and the former's theological position can be constructed from quotations preserved by the latter. As for the work of Leontius, a comprehensive treatment cannot be attempted here. We shall, however, try to bring out how, in the face of the Christology of the non-Chalcedonian section of the Church as developed by Severus, Leontius defended Chalcedon as indispensable for orthodoxy.

Severus refers to three passages from the work of the Grammarian which will show his ground for arguing that, unless Chalcedon was accepted, heresy could not be avoided. Of these, we have already referred to the first, according to which the Council of Chalcedon was concerned to exclude the docetic teaching of Eutyches and his partisans.[1] In other words, the Grammarian argues that in the days of Chalcedon there was evidence for the existence of a "Eutychian heresy." Those, therefore, who oppose the Council must be holding the heresy which the Council tried to keep out.

Severus quotes the second passage in this way.

> Of the fathers of the Church, who taught you these (things) O man? Cyril? But he affirmed that Mary the Virgin was Theotokos; for He was born of her in the same way as the soul of man is born with the body and is conceived to be one with it. The soul, however, is different indeed by nature (from the body), and, in relation to the latter, the former maintains its principle.[2]

As to the third passage:

> But he says that the soul and the body are one ousia. In the same way, the Lord became one with the flesh. As his evidence shows, he speaks plainly (of the Lord) that He is one in ousia, and not in prosopon.[3]

The point of the Grammarian seems to be this. In affirming "one incarnate nature," Severus and the non-Chalcedonians were maintaining that the *ousia* of Christ was one. This argument, obviously, takes it for granted that *nature* in the phrase "one incarnate nature" meant *ousia*. The phrase had been employed by Cyril, and the Grammarian recognised it as orthodox. So he maintained that the phrase "one incarnate nature," in the sense in which it had been used by Cyril and the fathers, was in no way different from the Chalcedonian phrase "in two natures."[1] So he wrote:

---

[1] See above p. 349.

[2] Contr. Gr., I, p. 29. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 34.

> Therefore, the blessed Cyril and those who affirm two natures of the Emmanuel exclude the heresy of Apollinarius. In order to condemn Nestorius, they accept the phrase "one incarnate nature of God the Word." When the two phrases are upheld, we have the right opinion. But when one of them is avoided, there enters some evil heretical opinion.[2]

In order to make the argument cogent, a distinction in meaning of the term *nature* between the phrases "one incarnate nature" and "in two natures" had to be drawn. For the Grammarian himself admits that *nature* in the first phrase could not mean ousia.[3] So, according to him, the distinction was this.

> When, therefore, the fathers employ *nature* alone, without adding "of God the *Word,"* they refer to *ousia*. They affirm that there are two (*ousias*) in Christ.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 107-108. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 131.

[3] However, he assumed that the non-Chalcedonians, for whom, in fact, *nature*, imall their phrases, meant *hypostasis*, took it in the sense of *ousia*.

> For they recognise Him as existing in one and in the other (ἄλλο καὶ ἄλλο), and as being of the same substance with the Father as well as of the same substance with us.

Again

> When he Cyril affirmed one nature of God the Word, he signified one of the Trinity, the Hypostatic Prosopon of God the Word, who is of the same substance with the Father possessing the same ousia of His Begetter. But when he added incarnate (referring to) the flesh animated with a rational soul, he affirmed the common ousia of men to have been assumed by God the Word. He does not refer to man as separated in form and prosopon, but to that which is commonly perceived in every man, namely ousia. For every man is flesh animated with rational and intelligent soul. As a means for the salvation of all men, he recognises the human ousia in union with one Prosopon of the holy Trinity, namely God the Word. Thus in the two natures, namely ousias, God the Word is known to have become man. For there is in Him the ousia of Godhead as well as the ousia of manhood.[1]

What, then, is the basis for drawing a distinction of this kind? The Grammarian has two answers. One:

> Following the words of the holy fathers, from whom we have learned that Christ is of the same substance ousia with God the Father and of the same substance ousia with us, we affirm that He is in two natures, namely two ousias.[2]

This, however, is not very convincing and the second ground of the Grammarian seems to be much more cogent.

---

[1] Contr. Gr., I, pp. 145-146. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 147.

> How are we to say that Christ is of two natures, if we do not take the term *nature* in the sense of *ousia*? They do not, by any means, say that *nature* refers to concrete hypostases. If they do, they have to affirm "of two prosopa"; for a concrete hypostasis is a *prosopon*.[1]

The Grammarian argues that, unless nature in the phrase "of two natures" is taken in the sense of *ousia*, the consequence would be Nestorianism.[2] The non-Chalcedonian tradition is opposed to the teaching of Nestorius, and therefore the term *nature* must mean *ousia*.

What does *ousia* mean? The fragmentary character of our evidence does not permit us to bring it out adequately. However, there is one passage, from which we can ascertian the direction of the Grammarian's thinking.

> How shall we not say, affirming, as we do, that He is perfect God, that the *ousia* of Godhead is in Christ without diminution? Confessing that He is perfect man, how shall we not say that the entire *ousia* of manhood is in Him? k For He did not assume part of the human *ousia*, as Apollinarius said, namely flesh without rational soul.[3]

This passage is an indication that, for the Grammarian, *ousia* stood for the perfect intelligible character of something. Thus *ousia* of manhood meant perfect manhood. However, it did not refer to a particular concretion of manhood. In this way, probably he tried to conserve the Cappadocian idea of ousia. There is one passage from the work of the Grammarian preserved by Severus in which a different emphasis can be observed.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 179.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 234-235. This passage has been referred to on p. above.

[3] Contr. Gr., I, p. 162.

> When we say that the two natures remain united hypostatically, they deliberately refuse to listen, ignoring the words "united hypostatically" found in our confession.[1]

Here we are faced with a real difficulty. Does the word hypostatically,[2] for instance, mean that each nature is an hypostasis? If it does, this passage contradicts an earlier statement in which we found the Grammarian clearly saying that the human nature did not have an individual character. In spite of the contradiction, if the Grammarian meant here that the human nature was an individuation of the ousia of manhood, his argument defeats itself; for, as we have seen, that is precisely what Severus maintained; and, this being so, the Grammarian did not prove that the Chalcedonian phrase was necessary to conserve orthodoxy. However, on this unproved ground, the Grammarian asserts:

> In this way, truly like men devoid of understanding, they have to admit that after the union one of the natures which

---

[1] Ibid., p. 152.

[2] The Grammarian must have meant to say that the incarnate Lord had one hypostasis, and that was a collective hypostasis. Even this idea was challenged by Severus. See below p. 426.

> formerly was in the union has become lost, and that there remains but one nature after the union.[1]

This, as we have seen, is an assumption, but for the Grammarian it is fact, and he writes:

> What, then! Does he not abandon one ousia, and does he not introduce complete mixture and confusion?[2]

If the non-Chalcedonian position had maintained that the Ousia of Christ was one, and if, in their zeal to safeguard the theory of one ousia, they were willing to sacrifice one of the two natures that were in the union, the Grammarian could have pointed to the Formulary of Reunion of 433, and successfully challenged the adequacy of their position. In fact, the Grammarisn wought to do this, taking two things for granted. On the one hand, he was cocksure that his reading of the non-Chalcedonian position was accurate; and on the other, that from the Formulary and its defence by Cyril contained in his letters to Acacius of Melitene and others "two natures after the union"--the very phrase which Cyril definitely excluded in them--would naturally follow.[3]

As for the phrase "two natures after the union," the Grammarian admits that it had been used by Nestorius. By this he himself meant to affirm that the flesh and God the Word were different one from the other. "God the Word, for instance, is one thing , and the flesh is another thing ." The error of Nestorius lay not in using this phrase; but in that "he did not confess the union as we do." In opposition to his teaching, "we affirm the union" in such a way that "we confess one Christ and one Son, the same to be one Lord, and therefore one nature of God the Word incarnate."[1] The point of the Grammarian is that the phrase "in two natures" means only that the two natures are different, and that they remain in the union without confusion or mixture. The Grammarian wants the phrase "hypostatic union," and even the body-soul analogy.[2] In order to show that none of the orthodox fathers had let either of the two natures which were in the union pass into oblivion thereafter, he quotes passages from men like Athanasius, the Cappadocians and Cyril. Thus, for him, Chalcedon clearly stated the traditional Faith of the Church.

---

[1] Contr. Gr., I, p. 244. [2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid., II, pp. 18-19, 167.

From the foregoing survey, the point of view of the Grammarian may be summarised in this way. Faced with the docetic Christology of Eutyches, the Council of Chalcedon conserved the Church's conviction in regard to the Person of Christ. By means of the phrase "in two natures" the Council affirmed that Christ was perfect God and perfect man. This phrase had been used by Nestorius. Since, however, he conceived of the human nature as having been a hypostasis, he took nature in the sense of hypostasis, and could not affirm hypostatic union. Cyril, on the contrary, had taken nature in the sense of ousia, and had made it clear that the manhood which God the Word assumed was humanity in general, not a particular manhood. In order to exclude "Nestorianism," the Alexandrine phrases, of two natures, hypostatic union, and one incarnate nature as well as the body-soul analogy are all orthodox. But since "Eutychianism" was a danger on the opposite extreme, the phrase in two natures is indispensable. The non-Chalcedonians refuse to accept this phrase. Therefore, they must be supporting the heresy which this phrase intends to keep out. Their refusal to speak of two natures after the union proves that, in their view, after the union one of the two natures has been absorbed by and lost in the other. They are, therefore, labouring under heresy.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 177.

[2] Ibid., pp. 182-183.

It must be remembered that the work of the Grammarian contained evidence that the author had used some of the earlier writings of Severus.[1] At the same time, he did not see any need for trying to understand what actually was the point of view of the man whom he was constrained to criticise. We have already seen the theology of Severus in regard to all the issues raised by the Grammarian, but we have not yet paid sufficient attention to one point.

---

[1] Contr. Gr., I, p. 41.

The entire argument of the Grammarian turns round his definition of the term *nature*. As we have noted, the non-Chalcedonians objected to the phrase "in two natures" mainly on the ground that it must mean "in two hypostases." At Chalcedon, it was the Antiochenes and the Roman legates that asserted this phrase. For the Antiochenes, in consonance with their theory of "prosopic union," the term *nature* meant *hypostasis*. As for the Roman legates, Leo's *Tome*, with its two natures each of which performs what is proper to it, could accomodate the Antiochene view. Therefore, the leaders of Chalcedon must have taken the term in the sense of *hypostasis*. It was this objection to the term that the Grammarian tried to exclude by redefining *nature*. That it could mean either *ousia* or *hypostasis* was granted by both sides in the East. Now the Grammarian adopted the first meaning by way of answering the non-Chalcedonian objection to the Council. However, since he was concerned to claim Cyril for Chalcedon, and since the latter had defended the phrase "one incarnate nature of God the Word," a simple ascription of the meaning *ousia* to *nature* was not feasible. The Grammarian had an easy remedy for this problem. Cyril, he argued, took *God the Word* as *hypostasis* and *incarnate* as referring to *ousia*.

In his refutation of the Grammarian's thesis Severus undertakes to make two points. On the one hand, his definition of *nature* (in the phrase "of two natures") as *ousia* is objectionable; and on the other, Cyril had not taken the human *nature* in the sense of ousia; therefore the definition is arbitrary.

Severus starts his discussion of the subject by pointing out that, if the union was of *ousias* and if *ousia* meant, as the Grammarian himself says, "that which is commonly perceived in all,"

> as applied to the holy Trinity, it is Godhead, for Godhead is the same in all the three Hypostases; and, as applied to the flesh animated with a rational soul, it is the entire human race. But the doctors of the Church have signified by *the union* the coming together of a particular flesh animated with a rational soul with God the Word.[1]

"Is it not plain to every one," he goes on,

> that the hypostatic union is the "composition" (σύνθεσις) of God the Word with *one* particular flesh, and not of *ousias* which are perceived in the signification of the general and the common. For it is not that, because the Father and the Holy Spirit are united with the Word in *ousia*, they became united with the flesh from Mary. Nor is it that, because the Word was united to the flesh animated with a rational and intelligent soul, and because

---

[1] Contr. Gr., I, p. 147.

> that flesh was of the same genus and substance with all men, the entire humanity became composed with the Word.[1]

The Incarnation, on the contrary, was of one Hypostasis of God the Word and of one particular manhood which was perfect, the flesh being animated with soul and mind.[2]

The individual character of Christ's manhood is again and again emphasised by Severus. However, his criticism of the Grammarian, as contained in the above passage and in many others takes _ousia_ in the sense of the actual existence (_esse_) of an aggregate of individuals belonging to a class. But, in challenging the Grammarian's claim that the _ousias_ became united hypostatically, we can observe a different emphasis.

> Explain to us, therefore, how those _ousias_, namely "the common" of Godhead and "the _common_" of manhood are united hypostatically, and how they concur and are perfected into one _hypostasis_.[3]

The argument may be put in this way. In the first criticism, Severus says that _nature_ cannot be taken in the sense of _ousia_, because the latter is a common name for the actual existence of all the members of a class. If we recall the two rather incongruous ideas found in Severus' definition of _ousia_, we shall realise that this criticism is more a liability than an asset. But, in challenging the Grammarian to show how two *ousias* could give rise to one hypostasis, he implies a principle of which unfortunately he does not take full advantage. If Severus were putting the question sharply, it should be, How could there be a union of God the Word with the human *ousia* without an individuation of manhood, and Christ be *a* man living under the conditions of concrete existence? We have already seen that, for Severus, there was an individuation of the human *ousia* in the union.

---

[1] _Ibid._, pp. 148-149. [2] _Ibid._

[3] _Ibid._, p. 151.

In answer to the Grammarian's argument that, because Christ is of the same substance with the Father and of the same substance with us, and because He is perfect God and perfect man, the term nature must mean *ousia*, Severus writes:

> Therefore, each one of the *hypostases* participates perfectly in the "common" of the *ousia*. But the *hypostasis* is not the entire *ousia* and the signification of the common, which consists in all the *hypostases*. Peter, for instance, participates in the "common" of manhood, and he is perfect man; but he is not the "common" and the *ousia* of manhood. In the same way, God the Word participates in the "common" of Godhead and is perfect God; but He is not the "common" and the entire *ousia* and Godhead, which consists in three *Hypostases*. When He became man without change, He united to Himself hypostatically a flesh animated with reason. He participated in the "common" of manhood and our *ousia* perfectly.[1]

Christ is thus spoken of as of the same substance with the Father and of the same substance with us. This, however, does not mean that the union was of ousias; but that it was of ousias individuated as hypostases. He is perfect God and perfect man, because in the union God the Word assumed an individuated manhood.

---

[1] Contr. Gr., I, p. 162.

For Severus, nature in the phrase "of two natures" also means hypostasis.

> When we say that Emmanuel is of two natures, we do not take nature in the sense of ousia. . . . But we say that the one Hypostasis of the Word and one flesh animated with rational and intelligent soul came together unchangeably and became composed into one. And He is one Nature and Hypostasis of God the Word incarnate.[1]

As we have noted, Severus is very clear that manhood was individuated in the union, and that therefore Christ did not have a separate human prosopon.[2] At the same time, he insists that the natures which concurred in the union are different, and that the union does not take away the difference between them.[3] Since, however, the union is real, we cannot point to certain words and deeds of Christ and say that they were exclusively of one or the other of the natures. But in our contemplation we can distinguish them and say that some of them are divine and some others are human. In other words, both

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 180.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 183-184. We have referred to this passage earlier.

[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 184-185.

Godhead and manhood are there in the one Christ, but they remain in an indissoluble union. It is to make this idea clear that the body-soul analogy is employed. All our behaviour, for instance, is mediated through the body, but we cannot say, in regard to anything that we say or do, that it is being performed either by the body or by the soul exclusively.

As for the phrase "of two natures," we have seen that it expresses two ideas. On the one hand, it refers to the fact that the union was of God the Word and an individuated manhood. On the other, it signifies the concurrence of these two hypostatic realities at every moment in the life of Christ. Both in and after the union, it was two ousias in their respective concretions, that unceasingly converged to form the one Christ. Therefore, to speak of a union of ousias, ignoring their hypostatic realities, is not the truth of the matter.

The purpose of this kind of emphasis is not, as the Grammarian tried to make out, to ignore the reality of one of the natures after the union.

> The natures and hypostases of which He has been composed are perceived in the union without diminution and change.[1]

The emphasis is, therefore, on the union.

---

[1] Contr. Gr., I, p. 187.

It is clear thus far that Severus answered all the points raised by the Grammarian against the theology of his section of the Church. We shall now pass on to show how the non-Chalcedonian theologian treated the Grammarian's claim in regard to Cyril. As we have noted, the latter had asserted that Cyril had taken Christ's manhood as humanity in general, not as "separated in form and prosopon." Severus argues that, in this reading, the Grammarian distorted the theology of Cyril. For, in his Fourth Book against Nestorius, Cyril had written:

> When once He came into those that belong to us and participated hypostatically in one flesh, in which He died for us and rose, It should be believed that He suffered voluntarily in the flesh.[1]

On the strength of this statement, Severus says that for Cyril "it was the Hypostasis of God the Word that was united naturally to one flesh animated with reason." He, then, goes on to treat the Cyrilline idea on the basis of his refutation of Theodoret's criticism of the Anathematisms. The bishop of Cyrus, says Severus, wrote against the third anathema.

> How, then, can he say that the hypostases, namely the natures should not be divided? For he admits that the Hypostasis of God the Word is before the ages perfect, and perfect also is the form of the servant which He

---

[1] Ibid., p. 204.

> assumed. Therefore, he granted hypostases and not hypostasis.[1]

Obviously, Theodoret understood Cyril to have meant a union of two *hypostases* and not of two *ousias*.[2] In his reply, Cyril did not express disagreement on this point. On the contrary, he wrote:

> When he hears that the union was natural (φυσική), namely a real coming together of *hypostases* . . . .

And again,

> Therefore, even though we understand that *hypostases* became united . . . .[3]

To andrew of Samosata's criticism of the same *anathema* also Cyril wrote, says Severus, making it clear that the union was of *hypostases*.

> To dissolve the manner of the true Incarnation is not without loss. When they separate the two *hypostases* which are removed from each other so that they may remain specific and divided, they have only a conjunction from outside. . . .

Severus says that Cyril wrote like this not only in his refutation of Theodoret and Andrew, but also in his exegesis of the anathematisms.[4]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 205. This point may be noted in Bindley, *The Oecumenical Documents*, p. 127.

[2] On this point, the *anathema* itself is clear; for it reads "If any one divides the hypostasis after the union . . . ." (Bindley, *op. cit.*, p. 127.

[3] Contr. Gr., I, p. 206.

[4] As we have already noted, Cyril wrote a defence

> Therefore, those who divide the hypostases after the union and place each one of them by itself, namely man and God, can speak only of an association of honour. Most certainly they establish two Sons. . . . They divide, as I said, the hypostases after the union.[1]

After having shown that Cyril did not take nature in the sense of ousia, Severus asks the Grammarian why he left this clear teaching of the great doctor and ventured to give out objectionable ideas on his own authority.[2] The conclusion is clear. The Grammarian's argument in regard to nature is an innovation. In fact, there is not a single point in the argument of the Grammarian which we have seen thus far that was not answered by Severus.

Sellers, however, has a different story. He thinks that the Grammarian actually proved his thesis and showed the need for defending Chalcedon even for the maintenance of the Alexandrine orthodoxy.[3] As we disagree with Sellers on this point, on the basis of the facts which we have tried to bring out, a few comments may be offered here in regard to his judgment.

---

of the Anathematisms in order to convince the Antiochenes that his theology was not a theology harbouring "confusion."

[1] Contr. Gr., I, pp. 207-208.

[2] Ibid., p. 209.

[3] For Sellers' treatment of the Grammarian's theology and of its refutation by Severus, see The Council of Chalcedon, pp. 292-301.

Before assuming that the Grammarian proved his thesis, four points need to be investigated. One, the theology of Cyril, especially the ideas basic to his writings referred to by the Grammarian himself. Two, the history of the Council of Chalcedon. Three, the arguments of the Grammarian for a connection between Cyril and Chalcedon. And four, the answer of Severus. The fact is that Sellers does not investigate any of these four points adequately throughout his work. As we have already dwelt at some detail on these points, we shall summarise our findings in this way.

One: After the Formulary of Reunion of 433, Cyril was questioned by Alexandrine conservatives why he sanctioned the phrase "two natures." As we have noted, Cyril wrote his defence to Acacius of Melitene,[1] Succensus of Diocaesarea,[2] Valerian of Iconium[3] and Enlogius the presbyter.[4] The Grammarian claims that these letters contain only the doctrine of Chalcedon. But, in regard to these documents, the fact is that in them Cyril opposed the phrase "two natures after the union," and still defended, in speaking of Christ after the union, "one incarnate nature of God the Word." As for the phrase "two natures" as the Formulary had it, he says that it is harmless; for it meant only that the natures of which is the one Christ are different, and that they are not confused or mixed. This obviously means that Cyril maintained the principle of the union as well as the reality of the natures without accepting the phrase "two natures after the union" at all.

---

[1] PG, LXXVII, pp. 181-221. [2] Ibid., pp. 228-245.

[3] Ibid., pp. 256-277. [4] Ibid., pp. 223-228.

Two: In our survey of the history of the Council of Chalcedon, we have seen that this Cyrilline emphasis was not even mentioned at the Council. On the contrary, the leaders of the Council assumed that the phrase "two natures after the union" was exclusively orthodox.

Three: The Grammarian's argument was that the Council maintained only the Cyrilline idea of the union.

Four: It is this kind of special pleading for the Council of Chalcedon that Severus called in question in his refutation of the Grammarian's work. Severus argues that Nestorius, whom this defender of Chalcedon renounces as a heretic with as much vehemence as he himself does, had not taught anything which Chalcedon did not declare exclusively orthodox.

These are the points which needed investigation in the sixth century as well as in the twentieth. The Grammarian in the sixth was not interested in them. Sellers in the twentieth has not shown that he has made any substantial progress in dealing with these points over what the Grammarian had done in ancient times. As for the non-

Chalcedonian position, we have already seen that it was not based on a denial of Christ's manhood after the union. Severus summarises the theology of Cyril as contained in his letters to Acacius and Succensus, which the Grammarian regards as orthodox, in these words. Cyril

> made it clear that the criticism of those who blamed him for agreeing with the Orientals to the use of "two natures" was objectionable and unlearned. What is it? Is it that, in affirming the union, one should not make mention of two natures at all? Union is of two or more things. To say that one is united to oneself does not make any sense, and is completely foolish. Even those who affirm "two natures" of the one Christ make mention of two natures. No one who thinks correctly has ever found fault with this. It is those who speak of the one Christ as two natures after the union, or those who assert that He came into being in two natures, that are to be blamed.[1]

This passage is a clear evidence that the Alexandrine objection to the phrase "two natures after the union" was the result of their emphasis on the union. In fact, the Grammarian tried to maintain the Alexandrine view of the union. But, because he was concerned to make out that the Council of Chalcedon did not establish anything else, he attempted to reconcile two irreconcilable positions. So, in his work, he included a large number of proof-texts from earlier Church fathers and argued that they had maintained the reality of the natures after the union. In the third part of his Contra Grammaticum, Severus examines the proof-texts and shows that they did not teach anything beyond what his section of the Church upholds,[1] but that the Council of Chalcedon went beyond the emphasis found in them and insisted on "two natures after the union."

---

[1] Contr. Gr., II, p. 168.

In concluding this treatment, we can say that the Grammarian took the phrase "in two natures" only as a symbol to conserve the truth that after the union the two natures were real in Christ. Even Dioscorus had not objected to this idea. If this were all that Chalcedon was concerned to safeguard, its leaders would have been more patient even in the case of Eutyches.

A more important theologian on the side of Chalcedon in the sixth century was Leontius of Byzantium. In none of his extant works, Severus makes any reference to Leontius. As we have seen, Severus was in Constantinople in 536. Sellers says that it is possible to think that Leontius participated at the *Collatio* arranged by Justinian between the years 531 and 536.[2] Whether he took part in the *Collatio* or not, that he had not risen to any theological eminence till then is fairly easy to be shown. We have already noted that Severus was on the alert to refute Chalcedonian works in defence of the Council. Thus he published the Philalethes during the first decade of the sixth century, and probably about that time solved the seven questions of the Chalcedonians. His Contra Grammaticum was a thorough examination of the claims of this adherent of the Council. Contemporaneous with the Grammarian's work, John of Scythopolis had published his treatise. In regard to both these, we have noted the complaint of Severus that they were distributed only among Chalcedonians, and that, though with some difficulty he obtained a complete copy of the former, he succeeded in securing only a few fragments from the latter, in spite of repeated efforts. It is, therefore, very reasonable to conclude that, had Severus known anything about the work of a Leontius, he would have done every thing in his power to refute it.

---

[1] About these proof-texts, Sellers writes, "the Grammarian is at pains to show that the doctrine of Chalcedon had been anticipated by Cyril, and that it was in complete accord with the teaching of the orthodox Fathers" (*op. cit.*, p. 296). That this was the claim of the Grammarian is true. But the point to be answered is this. Did those proof-texts, which were acceptable to both sides, prove that Chalcedon was even a necessity? Or did the Grammarian prove that his own theology was that of Chalcedon?

[2] *The Council of Chalcedon*, p. 311.

It must also be remembered that the failure of the non-Chalcedonians at the end of the Collatio in 536 was not due to any superior theological ability shown by Chalcedonians. On the contrary, it was the presence in Constantinople of Agapetus of Rome that changed the mind of Justinian, and the emperor's political ambitions in the West ensured success for the adherents of the Council. This fact is sufficient for us to conclude that there is here no evidence that even Justinian had regarded Leontius as a better theologian than Severus. The old Severus escaped from Constantinople in 536, and from that time Chalcedonian supremacy became established in the Byzantine empire. Now the triumphant party needed theological leadership both to express its victory and to attempt converting non-Chalcedonians to the side of the Council. The work of Leontius may well have served that purpose.

As for his Christological teaching, a comprehensive treatment on the basis of his own works cannot be attempted here. We shall, however, make use of Sellers' interpretation of Leontius' teaching[1] and see how far the Chalcedonian scholar succeeded in his efforts at defending Chalcedon.

According to Leontius, as Sellers says, the term "nature" implies "the principle of existence (τὸν τοῦ εἶναι λόγον); it signifies 'the species' (τὸ εἶδος), which comprises 'the genus' (τὸ γένος) and certain differentia, the terms 'animal,' 'rational' and 'mortal' describing what determines man's nature." "Nature," therefore, signifies, says Sellers, the being of a species, and Leontius uses the term *ousia* in the same strict sense. In other words, in agreement with both the

---

[1] For Sellers' treatment of Leontius' Christology, see *The Council of Chalcedon*, pp. 315-320.

see The Council of Chalcedon, pp. 315-320.

Grammarian and Severus, Leontius regards nature as meaning ousia, but, in disagreement with them both, he does not see in nature the meaning of hypostasis.

In Severus, as we have seen, there are two ideas in regard to ousia. On the one hand, it is the dynamic principle of being which when individuated becomes particular beings in concrete existence; and on the other, the aggregate of existent beings belonging to a class. For Severus, nature means either ousia or hypostasis. In the sense of ousia, the term nature can mean for him the two ideas mentioned above. According to the treatment of Sellers, Leontius also grants these two meanings for ousia and nature. The difference between the two men lies in the fact that whereas Severus regarded nature as hypostasis in addition to ousia, Leontius fixed the latter meaning to the exclusion of the former. If this reading is accurate, Leontius goes beyond what even the Grammarian had granted.

With regard to hypostasis, both Severus and Leontius agree that it is "an individual thing." However, in Severus we can see the idea that the individual thing itself is the result of an individuation of the ousia.

According to Sellers, Leontius introduced his theory of enhypostasia "in connection with the doctrine of the union." This, says Sellers, is "a theory which marks a distinct advance on what had gone before in Alexandrine thought."[1] However, he admits that it means only that "in Jesus Christ the Logos has 'united manhood to himself,' and that the manhood thus united to him is 'the own' (suum) of the Logos"—a teaching held by pre-Chalcedonian Alexandrine, Antiochene and Western theologians.[2]

This theory was propounded by Leontius, maintains Sellers, "in answering the argument of the Monophysites against 'two natures'"; for they had held that "a nature does not exist without a hypostasis."[3] Leontius accepted this proposition, says Sellers, and showed that between a hypostasis and "a nature without hypostasis" there can be an enhypostatic nature (φύσις ἐνυπόστατος)--"that is, a nature (or ousia) which, not an accident, is seen as existing, not in itself, but in another." In assuming manhood, God the Word united human ousia to Himself. Ousia can be conceived without any concrete existence, and, in that case, it is nature without hypostasis. But when God the Word united manhood to Himself, though He assumed the human ousia, in the union it received a hypostatic status, but it received that status only in the Hypostatis of God the Word. This is the theory of enhypostasia.

On the face of it, the purpose of Leontius was to establish his definition of the term "nature" as ousia.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 316.

[2] Ibid., p. 319.

[3] Ibid., p. 318.

If his concern was to answer non-Chalcedonian criticisms against the Council of Chalcedon or to the phrase "two natures after the union," and if he had any real understanding of their precise point, Leontius would not have adopted this devious method of argumentation. For instance, the point of Severus, as we have seen, was not that every nature must have a hypostasis and that therefore "two natures" must be excluded. On the other hand, he maintained that "nature" means either ousia or hypostasis; in regard to the manhood of Christ it should mean hypostasis, because it was an individuated manhood that God the Word assumed from Mary the Virgin; both Cyril and the Antiochenes had conceived of the manhood only in that way; in order to avoid the doctrine of "two Sons" to which this view can lead, Cyril had adopted the theory of "hypostatic union" and rejected the Antiochene phrase "two natures after the union"; the Antiochenes, on the other hand, had gone on asserting this phrase, and pretending to avoid "two Sons" spoke of the natures as united, meaning thereby only a "prosopic union"; Chalcedon accepted the Antiochene phrase "two natures after the union," and declared a document of the Faith the Tome of Leo; in objecting to the title Theotokos as applied to the Virgin, Nestorius had not taught anything more than this doctrinal position of Chalcedon, and Nestorius had been condemned as a heretic by the Council of 431; therefore, the theology of Chalcedon was heretical.

In his works against Severus Leontius answered none of these arguments.[1] Therefore, as in the case of the Chalcedonian work of Cyrilline excerpts as well as in that of the Grammarian's treatise, Sellers' judgment on Leontius' theory has been too quickly made.

The fact about the theory of enhypostasia seems to be that, by limiting the meaning of the term "nature" to ousia in the case of Christ's manhood, Leontius raised a cloud of dust and instead of complaining that he could not see, came out with this term as the most powerful eye glass by which to see through every heretical confusion that would affect the Church's doctrine of the Person of Christ. As we have seen, in his Contra Grammaticum, Severus had most severely criticised the Grammarian for saying that the manhood of Christ was ousia. Leontius, however, writes against Severus as though such a thing had never happened.

If the theory of enhypostasia meant only that Christ's manhood was not independent of the Logos, that idea can be traced back to an age most probably before even that of Cyril. For in a passage from pseudo-Julius of Rome quoted by Timothy Aelurus in his anti-"Eutychian" work, there is the statement that "the nature of the body was not independent."[1] In regarding the manhood as hypostatic, Cyril had, in fact, maintained that the human hypostasis of Christ was "the own" of the incarnate Logos. This emphasis was most crucial to the theology of Severus. As we shall se in a moment, both Cyril and Severus had gone beyond this emphasis. Therefore, Leontius' theory is no advance at all on Alexandrine theological thinking.

---

[1] PG, LXXXVI^2, pp. 1901-1945.

On the other hand, Leontius had a special reason for propounding the theory. He was trying to reinterpret the phrase "two natures after the union" without falling into "the Nestorian heresy." The Antiochenes also had taken the manhood of Christ as a _hypostasis_. That meaning had, therefore, to be excluded. So, following the lead of the Grammarian, Leontius took the term "nature" in regard to Christ's manhood as _ousia_. If Christ as man was human ousia, how could the ousia exist in a concrete world? Leontius answered this question by means of his _enhypostatic nature_.

It must be remembered that at the time when Leontius put forward this theory, the non-Chalcedonian ecclesiastical tradition had the Christology of Severus.

---

[1] See above p. 214.

According to his teaching, there was an individuation of manhood in Christ as in any other man. But at the very first moment of its formation in the womb of the Virgin, this individuated manhood was taken over by God the Word as His own. It was not without nature, hypostasis and even prosopon. Since, however, the individuation took place only in the union with God the Word who was assuming an incarnate state, the reality of human nature, hypostasis and prosopon was at no time independent of the union. This emphasis of Severus should be viewed along with two other ideas which we have noted in his teaching. One: The incarnate state of God the Word should be distinguished from His unincarnate state in the Triune Godhead. This means that, though the Son of God is the same in both states, the incarnation was possible because of a self-emptying on the part of God the Word. Two: He assumed the incarnate state by uniting to Himself an individuated manhood. In the union each nature--God the Word and the individuated manhood--retained its principle, but the natures exchanged their respective properties one with the other. Therefore, in uniting manhood to Himself, God the Word assumed a voluntary self-limitation, and formed "one incarnate nature of God the Word." Everything human and divine was performed by this nature. In this way, in the incarnate nature, neither God the Word nor the manhood performed anything except in and from the state of union.[1] Severus says, on the strength of quotations, that this was the teaching of Cyril.

At the time when Leontius put forward his theory of enhypostasia, as Sellers says, in answer to "the Monophysite" argument against two natures, this was the teaching of the ecclesiastical tradition characterised by means of this derogatory title. What, then, is the merit of the theory of enhypostasia over this teaching? If the view of Leontius assumed here is accurate, he took seriously the Cyrilline-Severian emphasis on the union and the idea that the manhood was taken over by God the Word as His own. But because he took over the Grammarian's idea that the manhood of Christ was ousia, he felt the need for an enhypostatic nature. In doing this, he showed himself more anti-Nestorian and Eutychian than any non-Chalcedonian theologian of his day. This statement needs clarification.

According to the Antiochenes, Christ's human nature was a human hypostasis. For the non-Chalcedonians also the human nature in the phrase "of two natures" was a hypostasis. In regard to the divine nature, no one objected to the affirmation that it was the Hypostasis of God the Word. The Grammarian and Leontius, on the contrary, took the human nature as human ousia but not human hypostasis. The theory of enhypostasia was, in that context, indispensable to express the fact that Jesus Christ lived as a man of flesh and blood in a world of concrete existence. However, Leontius achieved this goal by reducing the hypostatic nature of the manhood to a secondary level of importance. It is most certain, therefore, that, had Theodoret and other Antiochenes been given an exclusive choice between the Christology of Severus and that of Leontius, they would definitely have cast their lot with the former and not with the latter.

The sixth century historical developments on the Chalcedonian side will bring out the truth of this statement more clearly. For the theological interpretations of the Grammarian and Leontius did not lead that party to any appreciative understanding of the Antiochene position. The important men on the Antiochene side were Theodore of Mopsuestia, Diodore of Tarsus, Nestorius, Theodoret of Cyrus and Ibas of Edessa. All these men were practically condemned by the Council of 553 recognised as the fifth ecumenical Council by Chalcedonians. If, as professor Alivisatos seems to maintain, ecumenical Councils have a binding authority on the Church for all times,[1] this decision of the Council of 553 is an irrevocable judgment. For the non-Chalcedonians, on the other hand, there are only three ecumenical Councils. Even if they happen to argue that the Councils of 325, 381 and 431 have an eternally binding authority on the Church, they would be obligated on that account to condemn by name only Nestorius. Therefore, as far as regards conciliar anathemas, in spite of what Sellers thinks,[1] the sixth century Chalcedonians were more broadly anti-Nestorian than their opponents.

---

[1] See above p. 4.

In his theory of enhypostasia, if Leontius tried to give expression to a theological concern, it was not different from that of Eutyches. As we have already seen,[2] during his trial, when he was asked whether he confessed Christ to be of the same substance with us, Eutyches answered at first that till that day he had not spoken of the body of our Lord as of the same substance with us, because it was God's body. However, even before this statement, he had made it clear that "the flesh" of Christ was from "the flesh" of Mary. It is clear, therefore, as we have already noted, that his concern was not to deny that God the Word assumed manhood from a human mother, but to emphasise the Alexandrine idea that the manhood was made His own by God. On being further questioned, Eutyches had, in fact, expressed his willingness to accept the phrase

---

[1] For Sellers, as is borne out by many parts of The Council of Chalcedon, men like Severus on the non-Chalcedonian side refused to accept Chalcedon because they were thoroughly anti-Nestorian.

[2] See above pp. 36f.

"of the same substance with us." In asserting that the manhood of Christ was human ousia become hypostatic in the Hypostasis of God the Word, if Leontius had a theological concern apart from apologetic motives, it must have been an emphasis on the representative character of the Saviour's manhood. We have no reason to doubt that Eutyches had been trying falteringly to express this idea. For Severus, however, the permanence of Christ's saving work, for which such an idea may be taken as of value, lay not in an assumption by God of human ousia, but in God the Word who united to Himself manhood in one of its individuations.

Our discussion in this chapter will show the one side of the truth which Sellers should have examined more clearly in treating "the clarification of the Chalcedonian Faith." If sufficient attention is paid to the facts which we have tried to bring out, the theological synthesis of which Sellers speaks will be found to consist in an acceptance of the Alexandrine phrases by sixth century Chalcedonians. As for a synthesis of theological ideas, they missed the most fundamental emphasis of Cyril and showed themselves more anti-Antiochene than the real successors of the Alexandrine theological tradition. In an age when the Church was facing a tragic division, they supported one faction and misrepresented the other.

Conclusion

Our findings may be summarised in this way.

1. Neither the Council of Chalcedon nor its defenders in the sixth century did actually work out any synthesis of ideas affirmed by the earlier Alexandrine and the Antiochene ways of thinking. The leaders of the Council had shrewdly excluded the Alexandrine emphasis and declared exclusively orthodox the Antiochene position. Sixth century Chalcedonians, like the Grammarian and Leontius, took over the Alexandrine idea of the union of the natures; but, in regard to the manhood of Christ, they distorted the Alexandrine tradition. As for the Antiochene thinking, they definitely excluded it. Therefore, the synthesis of which they could speak was terminological.

2. Both the Council and the sixth century Chalcedonians misrepresented the point of view of their opponents in a way which would shock as much the moral sentiments of any modern man as it did the non-Chalcedonians in ancient times.

3. All the objections raised against the Council by its critics were based on facts. The adherents of the

Council, however, as far as we have examined their writings, misunderstood or ignored such objections.

4. The critics of the Council were not certain individual thinkers in the East who assumed an anti-Chalcedonian stand, every one in his own way. On the contrary, they were leaders of a section of the Church which repudiated the Council on the strength of the earlier accepted tradition of the Church.

5. Their theological position was accordant with Scriptures and well grounded in approved tradition, and the fact that they rejected the phrase "two natures after the union" had nothing to do with docetic trends current in the East in those ancient times.

6. They excluded such trends with as much vigour as Chalcedonians claim to have done, and answered all criticisms raised against their opposition to Chalcedon.

As we have noted, facts do not permit us to say that either the Council of Chalcedon or its defenders in the sixth century worked out any synthesis of theological ideas contained in the earlier traditions. On the other hand, in the Christology of Severus we can find a non-Chalcedonian theologian struggling with ideas affirmed by both Alexandrine and Antiochene teachers. This statement needs a word of explanation.

The difference between the two schools of thinking, as we have tried to show, may be put in this way. For the Alexandrines, "the coming down of God the Word," the indwelling of the Holy Spirit in the Virgin's womb, the formation of the babe in her, the union of the two natures--all these happened at one moment. Therefore, the Virgin is Theotokos--God-bearer--the union is hypostatic, and the child in the womb is "one incarnate nature of God the Word." He cannot be divided into two centres of being and operation. At the same time, the natures are not confused one with the other, but each one of them retains its properties as well as its principle of being. However, since they concurred into the union, their reality is expressed only in and from the inexplicable state of that metaphysical union. As we have already seen, Severus conserved every one of these emphases.

The Antiochenes on the other hand, started from an intellectual presupposition, for which God is infinite and man is finite. The union of the natures must, therefore, be such that God remains God and man remains man. Accepting this affirmation as inviolable, they tried hard to bring together the two natures, namely God the Word and the man from Mary. So they insisted that the Virgin is both Theotokos and anthropotokos (man-bearer); that the human nature is a hypostasis with its prosopon; that hypostatic union is inconceivable; that the natures remain two even after the union; and that therefore the union is prosopic. On the strength of these admissions, it is quite legitimate for Nestorius, as Loofs has shown,[1] to affirm that the prosopon of God the Word was also the prosopon of the man Jesus, and vice versa. Therefore, in everything perceivable or conceivable the two natures expressed an ineffable harmony. This itself was made possible, because God the Word took upon Himself a self-limitation.

If we view the status of the manhood affirmed by this Antiochene thinking, irrespective of the intellectual mould in which it is cast, we can see that, as man, Jesus Christ was an individual human being; for he was a hypostasis, nature and prosopon. So he was a particular man like any other man, and he lived in this world, subject to its finitude and historical limitations.

For Severus also, the human nature was a hypostasis with its prosopon. He could, therefore, say that, though he did not see value in the intellectual presupposition of the Antiochenes, his Christology took the reality of Christ's manhood with as much seriousness as the Antiochenes had done. However, in his view, the Antiochene theory of prosopic union was inadequate, because what it amounts to is that, by the help of God, the man Jesus of Nazareth maintained with God the relation intended for every man. This is precisely what no man could maintain, on account of the fall. So, following the Alexandrine fathers, Severus insisted on the hypostatic union, according to which the Incarnation was exclusively God's act. He raised Jesus of Nazareth in a unique way, assuming everything essentially human as His own. In the union, He let the human nature exercise its creaturely freedom; but because the human nature was created in union with Himself, it expressed itself only in and from the state of union. This does not mean that the manhood was engulfed by Godhead. On the contrary, God the Word respected man so much that, by a voluntary self-limitation, He acted, in His incarnate state, only in union with the manhood. In this way, if we may draw a consequence of Severus' thought, God made it possible for every man to attain through the Mediator, to a relation of prosopic union with his Creator.

---

[1] Nestorius, pp. 89-93.

This Christology of Severus does not at all minimise the reality of the manhood in Christ. We can most certainly say that, both for him and for Alexandrine theologians like Athanasius, the Cappadocians, Cyril, and Dioscorus before him, the Virgin's title Theotokos, the phrases "of two natures," "hypostatic union," "one incarnate nature" and "one composite nature," and the body-soul analogy were all soteriologically determined theological affirmations. Not one of these men was a biblical literalist, nor did they maintain an anthropomorphic conception of God. On the other hand, they belonged to a speculative theological tradition, and their concern was to proclaim Jesus Christ as the eternal Saviour of the entire human race. For them, salvation meant more than a mere restoration of the original harmony which God had intended for man to maintain with Himself. It is this theological concern that the Antiochene theory of a prosopic union could not express. So, Cyril and Dioscorus, each displaying familiar human limitations, opposed that theory with a deep-rooted conviction that it denied the reality of salvation itself. Without understanding their concern, both the Antiochenes and the leading bishops at Chalcedon took their theological affirmations in a too narrow sense. In this way, Nestorius, Theodoret, Ibas and other Antiochenes misrepresented Cyril's theology as Apollinarian heresy. However, neither the Antiochenes nor the representatives of Leo thought it expedient at Chalcedon to declare in the open that the earlier Alexandrines were heretics. To get over this problem, they drew a distinction between pre-Chalcedonian Alexandrines and Dioscorus, without indicating the ground on which this could be done.

As for Leontius, by his theory of enhypostasia, he did not actually go back to the theology of Cyril. At best, he may have based his understanding of Cyril on Basil of Selencia's[1] interpretation of the great Alexandrine. For Cyril had, as Severus has shown, maintained the hypostatic character of Christ's manhood. We shall not be wrong in saying that, without properly understanding Cyril's theology, Chalcedon paid him lip service, and allowed only a misunderstood version of the Alexandrine tradition to be available to its votaries. Having recognised as exclusively orthodox the Antiochene phrase "two natures after the union," the Grammarian and Leontius naturally felt the need for reinterpreting the Chalcedonian version of the Cyrilline theology. In their extreme opposition to the Antiochene way of thinking and its theory of a prosopic union, they must have thought it advisable to take the manhood as ousia. Leontius improved on the Grammarian by saying that the ousia of manhood became hypostatic in the Hypostasis of God the Word. But this was not the emphasis of Severus. For him, God the Word, in His incarnate state, assumed an individuated manhood. In order to emphasise the reality of the Incarnation, he insisted that the individuation happened only in the union. The union is a theological affirmation, and Jesus Christ remains an individual man.

---

[1] For this bishop's role in the controversy, see above pp. 81f.

The theory of enhypostasia is also a theological affirmation. It emphasises the Alexandrine theological concern for hypostatic union over against the Antiochene position. In regard to the theory, there are two ways of taking it. If we regard the term enhypostasia as implying that the human nature of Jesus Christ is *per se* only *ousia* and not *hypostasis*, having its only individuation in God the Word, then there is no real human individuality in the incarnate Lord. On the other hand, if we consider "in the Hypostasis of God the Word" alone as a theological affirmation, and leave the emphasis that "the manhood became hypostatic" for the concrete world,[1] Jesus Christ would be an individual man. In that case, Leontius made no improvement on what Severus had said. If the latter interpretation is truer to Leontius, his acceptance of the Antiochene phrase "two natures after the union" meant only that he took the phrase in a symbolic sense, as conserving the idea that Godhead and manhood were real in Christ. As we have seen, this emphasis was central to the Christology of Severus. Therefore, we can definitely say that Leontius made no advance on the teaching of the non-Chalcedonian theologian.

What, then, about Chalcedon? As we have seen, it divided the Church into two enduring groups; it provided a platform at a Council of the Church in the East and the West for the see of Rome to make, for the first time in history, its claim of universal suzerainty over Christendom; and it elevated the see of Constantinople over the historic sees of Alexandria and Antioch. Not one of these actions was necessary for the maintenance of orthodoxy, and we may blame the Council for all of them. In so far as the Faith of the Church is concerned, though not with full understanding and intent, the Council can be credited with having made a significant contribution. This point needs to be explained a little further.

---

[1] According to Leontius, the manhood became hypostatic in the Hypostasis of God the Word.

An extremely subtle theological thinking, the Alexandrine emphases were not all clear to many in the East in those ancient times. Their emphasis on "one incarnate nature of God the Word" could easily slip into a kind of thinking ascribed to Eutyches. In that situation the Antiochene emphases provided a real check on the Alexandrine. But the second Council of Ephesus in 449, though it did not challenge the authority of the Formulary of Reunion, did not see the danger to which a simple insistence on the phrase "one nature" would lead. The very fact that this Council did not speak out against Eutyches' reluctance to accept the phrase "of the same substance with us" and his statement that the natures were two before the union, is a clear indication that the bishops assembled there took the problem lightly. The contribution of Chalcedon lay in restoring the Antiochene emphasis to a position of respect, so that it may continue to function as a check on the Alexandrine tradition.

The greatest contribution to Christology in ancient times was made by the Alexandrine theological tradition. But as it was not easy to be comprehended, it could be misconstrued. The Antiochene contribution lay in making that point clear. By itself, the Antiochene Christology was not adequate. Insufficiency of a theological tradition, however, is no excuse for its exclusion from the Church. For the maintenance of the historic Faith of the Church, a balance between the two positions should always be safeguarded. Neither Chalcedon nor its sixth century defenders did actually achieve this goal. But the terminological synthesis made by the latter could help their posterity to maintain the needed balance. In the Christology of Severus this balance is discernible. He himself was certainly influenced by the Antiochene emphasis. In fact, his renunciation of that tradition as heretical need be taken only as pointing out its inadequacy.

A LIST OF WORKS MADE USE OF IN THIS STUDY

Athanasius. *Incarnation of the Word; De Decretis, or the Defence of the Nicene Definition; De Synodis; Tomus ad Antiochenos.* (In the *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers,* second series, Vol. IV.)

Basil of Caesarea. *Concerning the Difference Between Ousia and Hypostasis,* Letter XXXVIII; *A Transcript of the Faith,* Letter CXXV; *To Count Terentius,* Letter CCXIV. (In N. & P.N.F., second series, Vol. VIII.)

Bethune-Baker. *An Introduction to the Early History of Christian Doctrine.* London, 1903.

________. *Nestorius and His Teaching.* Cambridge, 1908.

Bindley, T. H. *Oecumenical Documents of the Faith.* London, 1950.

Cyril of Alexandria. *Letters* in *Patrologia Graeca,* Vol. LXXVII. Edited by J. P. Migne. 1859.

Deansely, M. *A History of the Medieval Church.* London: Methuen, 1925.

Duchsne, Louis Marie Olivier. *The Early History of the Christian Church.* Vol. III. English trans.

Evagrius Scholasticus. *Ecclesiastical History A. D. 431-594.* London: Bagster, 1846.

Gregory Nazianzen. *Theological Orations.* (In N. & P.N.F., second series, Vol. VII.)

Gregory of Nyssa. *On "Not Three Gods."* (In N. & P.N.F., second series, Vol. V.)

Harnack, Adolph. *History of Dogma.* Vol. IV. English trans. London, 1898.

Hefele, J. *History of the Councils of the Church.* Vol. III. Edinburgh, 1895.

Kidd, B. J. *A History of the Church to A. D. 461*. Vol. III. Oxford, 1922.

________. *The Churches of Eastern Christendom*. London: Faith Press, 1927.

Loofs, F. *Nestorius*. Cambridge, 1914.

________. *Nestoriana*.

Leontius of Byzantium. *Works Against Severus* in PG, LXXXVI^2.

Mansi. *Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova et Amplissima Collectio*. Vols. VI and VII.

Michael the Syrian. *Ecclesiastical History*. Edited by J. B. Chabout. Paris, 1910.

Prestige, G. L. *God in Patristic Thought*. London, 1952.

Perry, S. G. F. *The Second Synod of Ephesus*.

Raven, C. E. *Apollinarianism*. Cambridge, 1923.

Relton, H. M. *A Study in Christology*. London: SPCK, 1917.

Sellers, R. V. *Two Ancient Christologies*. London, 1954.

________. *The Council of Chalcedon*. London, 1953.

Wigram, W. A. *The Separation of the Monophysites*. London: Faith Press, 1923.

Zacharias of Mitylene. *The Chronicles*. English trans. by Hamilton and Brooks. London: Methuen, 1899.

Severus of Antioch. A volume containing the correspondence of Severus with Nephalius, and the letters exchanged between Severus and Sergius the Grammarian. Edited by Joseph Lebon. Lovanii, 1949.

________. *Le Philalethes*. Edited by Robert Hespel, Louvain, 1952.

________. *Contra Grammaticum.* Parts 1 and 2 in Vol. I; Part 3; chapters 1-21 in Vol. II; Part 3, chapters 22-42 in Vol. III. Edited by Joseph Lebon. Louvain, 1952.

________. *A Collection of Letters of Severus.* Edited with an English translation by E. V. Brooks in *Patrologia Orientalis*, XII.

________. *Hymns of Severus* in *Patrologia Orientalis*, VI.

________. *Homilies of Severus* in *Patrologia Orientalis*, VIII.

________. Correspondence between Julian of Halicarnassus and Severus. British Museum 17200.

________. Severus' work against Julian. British Museum 12158.

Life of Severus of Antioch

Athanasius. *The Conflict of Athanasius*, in *Patrologia Orientalis*, IV.

John of Aphthynia. *Life of Severus*, in *Patrologia Orientalis*, II.

Zachariah. *Life of Severus*, in *Patrologia Orientalis*, II.